DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 267 24 EA 003 046

AUTHOR	Lake, Dale G.
TITLE	Cooperative Project for Educational Development. Volume II, Case Studies.
INSTITUTION	National Training Labs. Inst. for Applied Behavioral Science, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. National Center for Educational Research and Development.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-0069
PUB DATE	[70]
GRANT	OEG-3-080069-43(010)
NOTE	170p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$8.60
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies (Education), *Change Agents, *Consortia, Decision Making Skills, *Educational Development, Interpersonal Competence, *Intervention, Learning Processes, Organizational Climate, Problem Solving, Projects, *School Systems, Sensitivity Training, Teachers

ABSTRACT

Essentially, the COPED project attempted to apply to the public school system knowledge of, and experience with, planned change to create an internal change process that would increase problem-solving skills and improve interpersonal competencies of staffs. Operationally, this meant that each school system would develop its own capabilities to conduct a continual problem census that would expose organizational difficulties and to design training programs to meet the needs identified by the problem census. These studies compile the project findings of what factors did and did not facilitate change. (Related volumes are EA 003 045 and EA 033 047). (Author)

BR 8-0069
PA 24
EA

ED0 42267

VOLUME II

CASE STUDIES

Cooperative Project for Educational Development

Project Director
Dale G. Lake

EA 003 046

Contract OEG. 3-8-080069-43 (010)
Project No. 8-0069

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CASE STUDIES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
An Overview of the COPED Case Studies	1-9
An Emergent Inter-University Consortium for Educational Change	1-17
Boston Regional Center	1-6
Hancock	1-23
Hamilton	1-5
Franklin	1-6
Jefferson	1-9

New York Regional Center

Reflections on a project in Self-Renewal in two school systems	1-12
COPED in Old City	1-17
COPED in Buckley	1-8
Comstock School Building	1-28

Michigan

Andreos	1-6
Sarious	7-13
Manhattan	14-20
Anderson	21-28

AN OVERVIEW OF THE COPED

CASE STUDIES

Robert H. Luke, Jr.

Introduction

An essential purpose of the COPED project was to apply knowledge and experience with planned change to the complex phenomenon of the public school system. The anticipated outcome was the creation of a change process internal to each system which would allow school staffs to increase their problem solving skills and improve their interpersonal competencies. Operationally, this meant that each school system would develop its own capabilities to:

1. Conduct a continual problem census to bring to the surface organizational problems. This necessitated acquiring skill in various forms of data collection, interpretation, and feedback. It also necessitated the development of a high trust climate so that the data would reflect honest concerns.
2. Design in-service training programs to meet the needs being identified by the problem census. Such problems would have a two-fold payoff. In addition to improving specific problems, they would allow for a continuing program of professional development.

This volume attempts to summarize the results of the project as experienced by the individual systems as documented by the case studies in Volume III.

It has not been possible to specify training interventions, situational variables and outcomes in a way that would allow one to relate outcomes to interventions in a meaningful way because the training program was brought to an abrupt and unexpected end after one year. When it ended:

1. Viable relationships were established between the consultants and the school systems.
2. The project had gained a working degree of acceptance within each system.
3. The several waves of data collection had been completed.
4. A greater degree of upward communication within systems had been established allowing priority problems to be aired.

5. Change agent teams had been formed within each system and most had received some initial training from the consultants.

6. Some systems had received feedback from the initial data collection wave and plans had been finalized for providing feedback to the other systems.

7. The regional consultant teams had finalized their data collection and training strategies.

8. The consortium had a year of working experience behind it and was operating effectively.

In other words, the project ended (the funds stopped) when both clients and consultants were in a state of readiness to engage in an in-depth, system-wide program of planned change.

In the case studies, the four regional centers describe the way they intervened with school systems. No attempt was made to devise a way of reporting to be used by all centers, and each has prepared its report in the form it considered best for describing its experiences and conclusions. What is provided here is detailed information about the different staff's dilemmas, their impressions of how they got into the dilemmas and what they think they learned.

Theories and People

At the risk of overemphasizing the obvious, one of the major problems, and at the same time the most creative challenge, was implementing theories and strategies of planned change in the real life organization of the school. The two COPED volumes produced during the first year of the project, tried to articulate proposed relationships between significant variables, identifying potential points of resistance to be reasonably expected from the clients, and describing the major structural components of a school system. In addition, each of the regional teams did a comprehensive job of designing strategies which would optimize the results of their interventions.

The initial effort of the Michigan team was to train teachers and principals in problem solving and interpersonal competency skills. They in turn were to train others in the system as a way of creating maximum dissemination of the consultant resources and beginning the process of developing the systems' internal training resources. In addition, a special program of diagnostic skill training was planned for those in the systems who had cross-building responsibilities.

While Michigan's strategy began in the classroom with a view to moving from there to higher levels, New York's strategy was to begin with the upper administrative echelons and work down. Boston selected the principalship as the point of initial entry. All strategies shared a commitment to eventual total involvement of the system.

The differing strategies were seen as having a high experimental potential. They allowed the consultants to test previously untested hypotheses of planned change. In the process of implementing theories and strategies, the consultants had to involve and obtain the approval of the power elements, ellicit the involvement and interest of people who would serve as internal change agents, establish a working and trustful relationship between themselves and their clients, and maintain the effectiveness of their own consultant team. These responsibilities represented the realities with which any theory of planned change must cope.

Introducing COPED to the Client

The first need was to identify three-to-five systems in each region which would participate as clients. In practically all cases, COPED took the initiative. Both Michigan and New York invited 20-30 superintendents from nearby systems to a one-day meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce them to the concepts and purposes of the project and then allow superintendents to indicate their degree of interest in committing their system. They could indicate their degree of interest in committing their system. They could indicate a willingness to become a participating system, to serve as a control system in which data would be collected but no training would be done, or to show no interest.

Both meetings were very similar. COPED staff members presented short lecturettes explaining the theory and conducted several training activities to give participants a sample of the training aspect of the program. At the end of the meeting, participants were asked to fill out a card indicating their degree of interest. The COPED staff then took the responsibility of contacting those systems who expressed an interest and determining which systems would finally be selected.

The systems in the Boston region were recruited individually. In Franklin, the superintendent was actively interested in the goals represented by COPED and decided to participate following a meeting with the Boston project director. The Jefferson system was already engaged in a consultant relationship with Boston University and saw participation in COPED as an effective way to continue the consultant relationship. The Superintendent in Hancock had established an internal committee to propose in-service training ideas. The committee's suggestions were very similar to the goals of COPED, and on the basis of this similarity, the superintendent agreed to participate. The COPED-Hamilton contract was negotiated by the superintendent and the project director.

The Superintendent: Choosing the Internal Change Agent Teams

In practically all the systems, involvement of the superintendent was crucial. Regardless of a team's eventual strategy, the first contact with the system came through the superintendent's office. The involvement of the superintendent, in many instances, was a mixed blessing for the COPED staff. While his approval was needed to gain access to the system, the way in which he made decisions and how he was perceived by subordinates in the project often had a direct bearing on the direction the project took in his system.

Typically, the superintendent took an active role in deciding who would serve as members of the internal change agent team. The superintendents chose the teams in a similar fashion - without involving those people significantly affected by the decision in the decision-making process. The internal teams were often chosen by the superintendent, his immediate staff, and one or two members of the COPED staff. This resulted in mistrust of the superintendent and the COPED staff, which was seen as a 'tool' of the administration.

This mistrust is noticable in the Boston reports on Franklin, Jefferson, and Hancock. At Franklin, the mistrust was strong enough to prevent the appointed team from functioning at all. In Hancock and Jefferson, on the other hand, members of the change agent team (mostly principals) were selected by the superintendent with little information being communicated to the teachers. While the change agents themselves were enthusiastic, the non-involvement of their teachers created some initial handicaps to the change agents' efforts.

In New York, this issue of mistrust is particularly noticeable at Buckley where the superintendent called a one-day training meeting to introduce selected teachers and principals to COPED. The superintendent's initiative created a good deal of mistrust toward COPED on the part of the participants who referred to the meeting as "St. Valentine's Day Massacre". The situation was further complicated by a change in superintendents shortly thereafter. The new superintendent is described as more innovative and direct than the outgoing superintendent. He participated in an off-site training session designed to develop a more trustful attitude toward COPED. His administrative style and the off-site workshop were seen as the major reasons for Buckley's decision to continue with COPED.

The same issue arose in Michigan but apparently was not felt as strongly. But, several of the case studies report instances of teachers feeling either a direct or indirect pressure from the principals to attend meetings and feared that COPED was an administrative tool being used to evaluate their classroom performance.

When those affected by the decision about internal change agent teams were involved in the decision-making process, there wasn't so much mistrust of COPED.

In Comstock, the only case study of a single school building, the principal and one teacher were involved with COPED in another system and wanted to try it with their school. The principal asked for faculty members who wanted to participate in a one-day introductory micro-lab. From the beginning the faculty was involved and subordinate-superior relationships were open to question. This was seen as a good start. As a result faculty meetings are described as more open and productive. In the case of Old City, an advisory committee was formed with the involvement of several levels of personnel in the system and this committee helped others in the system trust COPED.

One conclusion from the difficulties involved in selecting members of the change agent teams would seem to be that training actually begins upon first contact with the system. In simplified terms, the COPED project was designed to change highly centralized decision making to more decentralized decision making, low levels of trust to higher levels of trust, inflexible downward communication to more flexible two-way communication; to mention only three targets. In many cases, COPED was introduced into systems where the norms operating were those COPED wanted to change. This seems to have created resistance over and above what would be expected under the best of circumstances. From the perspective of the consultants, the problems of the systems were thrown into sharp relief, which undoubtedly facilitated the problem census. From the perspective of the clients, however, COPED did not appear initially as an innovative change mechanism.

The superintendent's involvement in the project, other than his involvement in choosing the internal change agents, had an important effect in the project. The Detroit and Buckley case studies show the dramatic effect that a change in superintendent can have on a project of this kind.

Client-Consultant Relationship

Of obvious and crucial importance to a project of this kind is establishing and maintaining a working relationship between the consultants and the systems. As seen by the COPED staff the relationship could be divided into three phases: (1) Gaining access to the system (which, as we have seen above, presented certain difficulties); (2) Collaborating with the system through internal change agent teams, with these teams taking an increasingly active role in the training design and its execution; (3) Withdrawing, when the systems were ready to continue on their own with a minimum of outside consultant help.

1. Gaining Access - The majority of participants from each system did not encounter the COPED staff until the first official training activity. The case studies of these events report that the client-consultant relationship was an important issue. The COPED staff and the participants had to spend some time working through feelings of mistrust and suspicion before the training could really begin to take hold.

2. Collaborating - In all cases, representatives from each system were active in the planning process with the consultants. The report on Old City details some of the issues involved in collaborating. Buckley, Livonia, Brooklyn, and Jackson provide

a historical description of the collaborative relationships. The latter three cases report that a noticeable degree of strain was evident as the project moved from data collection to training interventions. The change agent teams within each system had a great deal of control over the use of the research instruments. As problem-solving training was to begin, the internal teams began to feel less influential and reported feeling controlled rather than collaborative. Here, for the first time in the relationship, the specialized resources of the university consultants were needed. They had to help re-examination of the relationship between themselves and the internal teams. In the case of Michigan, the result seemed satisfactory to both parties. Michigan COPED consultants were even called in for non-COPED projects and one by-product of the project was a bettering of the overall relationship between the university and the school systems.

3. Withdrawing - Given the early termination of funds, this phase of the relationship came about earlier than anticipated. However, several of the studies, Detroit in particular, indicate that some systems were able to continue the program with a drastic reduction in consultant help.

Reactions to the Data Collection

A major part of the COPED strategy in each region was the use of research instruments. This is discussed in Lake's and Callahan's chapter on research methodology. The case studies from New York and Boston almost unanimously report feelings of frustration and confusion over the data collections. For many, it represented an uninvited intrusion into the classroom or administrative council. For others, it was simply a foreign element to be dispensed with as quickly as possible. In many instances, negative reactions to the data collection were probably part of the overall reaction directed toward the COPED project in the early stages. Systems began to look much more favorably on data collection as they received feedback from previous collections and gained a clearer understanding of research findings within their own system and the ways in which data collection can serve a useful diagnostic function.

The COPED Consortium

Also included in Volume II is a description of the workings of the inter-university consortium which coordinated and administered the COPED project in the several regions. The development and maintenance of the consortium is itself a major product of the project. It demonstrates the feasibility of utilizing multiple and specialized resources in the service of a major project. One interesting thing about the consortium case is that it experienced many of the same problems as the school systems. Some of the major issues included maintaining the autonomy of each team yet developing a single project rather than five regional COPEDs, trying to establish a model of decentralized decision making rather than operating by administrative fiat, developing open channels of communication, etc.

Summary and Conclusions

To leave the reader with the impression that COPED was one long series of serious problems with few results would be erroneous. It is true that COPED does not represent the traditional success story, i.e., all the research hypotheses were not fully validated, the participating systems, as has been noted above, were left more in a state of readiness than demonstrable improvement. Though it is true that with more time these would have been possible, the experience has proven to be quite valuable. What we have is an account of the problems encountered when the worlds of applied behavioral science and public education meet. While it takes time and creates problems, it is by no means an impossible marriage. Indeed, if there is one common thread running through the case studies, it is a glimmer of potentiality once the client-consultant relationships had been established and persons in the system have developed a commitment to educational improvement.

AN EMERGENT INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

Robert A. Luke, Jr., COPED Documentarian
Dorothy Mial, COPED Coordinator

CHAPTER II.

INTRODUCTION - The Initiation of COPED

COPED has its origins at many points over the past twenty years when a number of behavioral scientists, brought together under the aegis of the National Training Laboratories of the NEA, were exploring ways of using scientific knowledge and educational methods to improve social practice. A group of these were brought together in September 1964, as an NTL Core Committee on Education. The group included Ronald Lippitt, of the University of Michigan, as chairman; Paul Buchanan, of Yeshiva University; David Jenkins, of Temple University; Matthew B. Miles, of Teachers College, Columbia University; Donald Orton, of Lesley College; Herbert Thelen, of the University of Chicago; and Goodwin Watson of Newark State College, with Dorothy Mial as convener and coordinator for NTL.

The charge was to establish priorities and realistic goals for NTL in education, to stimulate and respond to demands for training and consultative help from local schools and from educational associations--e.g., intern training, regional laboratories, recruitment of adjunct staff--and to help in securing funds for programs in education. The intern program was explored tentatively and was to become a reality in the summer of 1966. The greatest immediate interest, however, was around the creation of an inter-university consortium which would link NTL resources at the institutions represented by the committee in a joint action-research project aimed at the exploratory development of models of planned change in a number of school systems. After considerable committee work Max Goodson, NTL Fellow then on leave from Boston University, was retained to pull the work of the Committee together and to draft a proposal seeking U.S. Office of Education support for "an inter-university and school system program for aiding school personnel to apply behavioral science knowledge to efforts in improving educational practice." Dr. Goodson subsequently moved to the R & D Center at the University of Wisconsin and was instrumental in involving the Center as an affiliated member of COPED.

The Goodson draft was re-worked by the Core Committee, augmented by help from Dale Lake and Charles Jung, then graduate students at Teachers College and the University of Michigan, in January 1965, when each member committed a part of his own time and that of some of his colleagues to the project should it be funded. Notes of the meeting indicate that "Overall, we moved the proposal from an applied research project (aimed at comparing the consequences in school change efforts of two kinds of outside help--the one focused primarily on problem-solving training and the other focused primarily on sensitivity training) to a three-year program of conceptualization, involvement, training, action research, and production of materials for dissemination which could eventuate in a new facility on planned change for the improvement of education. This would be an inter-university center with a staff that actually functions as a staff (with roles, division of labor, etc.) but is based on different campuses."

Some of the design issues posed at this meeting have continued to concern COPED and have been reflected in some of the differences in strategy among the centers. The Committee, for example, was asking:

> What kinds of relationships with a school or system are maintained after initial team training? Do we relate to the team only or to other parts of the system as well? Are we training change agent teams (trainer of trainers) or working as consultant in system?
>
> Do we provide help on specific innovations or work on larger organization improvement efforts? In either case how many and what kinds of people within system are involved directly? How much commitment to maintenance function?
>
> What inputs to the system regarding research utilization, action research, diffusion of innovation, direct training of insiders to utilize these inputs (what sensitivity training, theory development, practice, etc.)?
>
> We looked at two approaches:
>
> 1. We intervene in a system and find out what effect the input yields.
>
> 2. We help define the state to be changed, set target, decide what input is required to reach the target. The change target might involve difficulty ranging from a new or increased skill to a basic change in policy or structure. We began by asking what triggering-off intervention is most effective. We moved on to supporting the possibility of developing a typology (if you want this kind of change, you need this kind of intervention). We recognized that to set change goals we would have first to work with school systems in setting change targets. All of this we saw as demanding an intensive effort to conceptualize "the state of the art of science" of planned change and the uniqueness of change in educational systems. (Drawn from January 23, 1965 minutes.)
>
> Our hoped for outcome was validated models of planned change based on conceptualizations, training, and consultation, data collections, and re-conceptualizations. Research was seen as exploratory. Rather than starting with hypotheses and testing them, COPED would generate hypotheses and test them. We saw action and research and training as integral parts of a change effort. We saw the early involvement of collaborating school systems as important.

The following pages describe the creation of COPED from the initial pre-contract staff seminar at Bethel in August 1965, to the fall of 1967. This report is drawn from several sources: the observations of the authors, the taped records of team meetings and national conferences, minutes, summaries of telephone conference calls, and reports of national meetings. While the work of COPED lies largely in the regional centers and schools, the effort to create a cross-center action research and training facility is important for whatever help it may be to other national or regional efforts in linking resources in collaborative educational improvement programs.

AN EDUCATIONAL NEED

The American school today is under great pressure to innovate. The pressures of day-to-day routine, however, generally prevent educators from systematically assessing changing needs, creating effective mechanisms for diagnosis, thinking through alternative action plans, assessing consequences throughout the system, and evaluating the impact of actions innovated. The more familiar pattern is to accept "change" if it comes in a package that apparently can be imposed upon existing structure. Universities, on the other hand, produce theories and research related to educational change but typically without being functionally linked to school systems. Often the resources of a university are introduced through lectures or papers which do not consider the unique organizational needs of the system nor provide assistance in developing the needed skills in action, research, and training. The results may be dysfunctional. A critical need of school systems is thus help in utilizing behavioral science theory and knowledge and methods. There is need on the one hand to establish links with university and other outside resources and on the other hand to develop internal resources for ongoing work.

COPED AS A RESPONSE TO NEED

The Cooperative Project for Educational Development is an inter-university consortium formed in response to these needs. COPED has no specific program of instruction or reform; rather it has attempted to introduce into school systems various techniques of action research that would increase the system's ability to reappraise its goals and methods to improve the system. Specific training programs were developed as needs for internal resources were identified.

COPED began officially in November 1965 as a three-year inter-university school system project at the end of which time it was hoped each system would have the skills and motivation to institutionalize problem-solving approaches to change. A major goal was to learn more about the inside-outside resources, structures, methods required to help school systems become "self-renewing" -- i.e., able to continue change efforts with decreasing reliance on outside help.

ASSUMPTIONS UNDERLYING THE INITIATION OF COPED

1. A consortium would be costly but more effective in meeting the above

needs than a number of organically unrelated efforts.

There is an uneven distribution of resources among universities and a diversity of approaches. Some campuses are strong in research. Others are stronger in areas of training and consultation as a means for converting behavioral science knowledge into social technology and practice. Access to research and change resources would be increased if several universities could be linked together in a common project. The sum would be more than the sum of the parts.

The validity of this assumption was perhaps best illustrated in the development of the core packet of instruments. The Measurement Committee was able to consider some 400 instruments (related to 1600 variables) known to or developed by various COPED staff members.

As an inter-university facility, COPED would also provide greater intellectual challenge and stimulation than would be available on any single campus.

The opportunity to compare different change strategies was also an argument in behalf of the consortium. Michigan, for instance, was especially interested in the improvement of conditions for classroom learning; New York focused its early attention on the administrative superstructure of the system as essential support for change; Chicago on a consultative-collaborative relationship with one school district and intensive work with an internal steering committee; and Boston on in-service human relations training for teachers and administrators at different levels of intensity in several systems. Opportunity to test these strategies in a large number and variety of school systems would be a fourth advantage.

Since the intent of COPED was to develop empirical generalizations about what kind of intervention could be expected to yield what results in what kind of school system, the diversity of systems in the seven states of the consortium was an important asset.

These values were deemed to be worth the cost of communicating across distance, of having to give up some autonomy, and of complicating the developing of a coherent research design. COPED saw the potential of full utilization of cross-center resources with the best resources setting standards for the rest, but also realized the danger of regressing through non-creative compromise to the lowest common denominator.

2. A second assumption was that the consortium itself should reflect the values and the approaches to be offered to school systems. There is full awareness that this ideal of consistency was only partly realized. In practice it meant a commitment to emergent competence-based leadership, to openness, to problem-solving methods, to concern over trust, and to willingness to invest time and energy in process work to develop trust and openness. Some of the practices and structures described below represent an attempt to work at these objectives--e.g., use of a "micro-lab" on interpersonal relations, conducting of

important committee sessions with the total staff present as observers, use of long conference calls, open committee sessions, taking time at staff meetings to look at feelings and their impact on work. COPED did not fully achieve its organizational objectives, and there were undoubtedly occasions when permissiveness resulted in a leadership vacuum. At the same time there were repeated efforts, some successful, to express organizationally certain methodological principles and philosophical values. COPED did succeed in mobilizing and bringing into collaboration a wide range of special skills.

The COPED staff tended to accept and attempted to operationalize that theory of organizational management which says that there are healthy alternatives to control from the top (McGregor). People will work responsibly for organizational objectives when they have relatively free choice in deciding what they want to work on, when organizational needs and personal needs are congruent, when they are treated as responsible persons with the power to influence decisions affecting them. One of the recurring challenges, never fully resolved but frequently worked on, was how to achieve a balance between discipline or direction and responsible freedom. The staff also started with common assumptions about the possibilities of orderly processes of planned change (Lippitt) and about the importance of problem solving through productive small groups where task and maintenance are integrated, where it is legitimate to express and use feelings (Bradford, Gibb, Benne).

ISSUES AND DILEMMAS ENCOUNTERED

1. Autonomy of Each Center.

The decision to attempt one project rather than develop several regional projects, made it necessary to invent ways to keep the whole informed about activities of the parts, to use the resources of the whole in support of the sub-parts, and to cope with problems and issues stemming out of this attempt.

From the beginning there was a degree of tension around the dual commitment at each center to work under guide lines in order to assure comparability and to realize the special objectives and interests at each center. This issue provided stimuli for collaboration as well as for frustration. At issue were what restraints would integration place on regional interests? How far would the demand for comparability restrict freedom in selecting school systems as collaborators? How would decisions get made and by whom? Decision-making processes had not been clearly established prior to the project and there were no clear guidelines on criteria for influence and reward. COPED staff at the beginning tended to place themselves at different points on a continuum ranging from firm commitment to a tight design at the cost of autonomy to a complete acceptance of diversity with a general commitment to a sharing of learnings about different pathways to common goals. At the beginning there was probably more autonomy than acceptance of control.

In time the demands of the research itself together with frustration over lack of firm direction tended to build in greater acceptance of control. Various structural efforts to cope with this issue are described later.

2. Power

The issue of power reared its head in several contexts. COPED was initiated by the NTL Core Committee who continued to be active in the project but to a degree as "elder statesmen." When the Executive Committee was created the Centers were represented largely by younger and newer staff. (They came to be referred to as "alternate heavies.") Were they independent or mouthpieces for the senior group? Power was also a reality to be dealt with in the school systems. Indeed one basic strategy involved initial legitimation at the top. It was also an issue within Center teams. For example, one team selected power as a variable which they were interested in measuring in schools. One of their contributions was a clear explanation of the dynamics involved in the hierarchical power relationships within a school system. In a group interview with the team at one of the national conferences, it was noted that the team itself seemed to have some problems around the power issue. (It is significant that COPED by this time had reached a point of being able to counsel with this team and to help them see the issue more clearly.)

3. Team Building

Maintaining the consortium made team building a necessary concern. Some staff members had worked together over the years but the total group met for the first time as COPED staff. Uncertainty and delays about funding made it difficult to create and maintain a full staff and to build teamwork.

4. Staff Continuity

While there has been considerable continuity both at the "elder statesman" and the "alternate heavies" levels there has also been considerable shifting of personnel. This posed at each national conference the necessity for assimilating new members, building the group anew, bridging communications differences, and for continual reintegration.

5. Collaboration with School Systems

The initial COPED proposal called for a three-year project starting with an assessment of "the state of the art" of planned change in education but moving quickly to collaborative work with school systems. The initial contract, however, was for a one-year inter-university conceptualization program. The fact that funds did not enable us to enter into any firm commitments with school systems delayed the real involvement of school persons who should have been involved from the beginning. The support system as well as the initial design, in other words, encouraged the all too common tendency to plan for school systems rather than with them. In COPED the commitment to early involvement was strong enough that the Centers initiated relationships with school systems during the first year but with the calculated risk that the project might not be continued. It seems probably that a different initiation might have laid a firmer foundation for creating university-school system collaboration. As it was, the systems were sufficiently involved by the spring of 1967 that they joined with one another in submitting a joint proposal for continuing funds under Title III with continuing support for university services and for the consortium. In view of the competition with other projects and the time required for writing proposals and getting approval by Board, etc., this is in fact an indication of involvement.

6. Integration of conceptual work with other tasks.

One thread running through COPED has been a commitment to conceptual work and the necessity to defend this commitment against various organizational demands. The mutual stimulation at the conceptual level and at the level of collaboration around such tasks as research designs, instrumentation, documentation, training, funding has been defined as one of the rewards justifying the time and energy required to maintain COPED.

7. Communication

With limited budget the issue has been how could enough communications be maintained among the Centers to keep a joint effort moving in the same direction and to engage sufficiently in continuous reappraisal of goals that congruence or its lack could be determined. Similar problems appeared within teams and came to be legitimate concerns across Centers. Also of concern has been communication between the COPED staff teams and the school systems.

ACTIONS TAKEN TO MANAGE ISSUES

National Staff Seminars and Work Conferences

Quarterly all-COPED staff seminars and work conferences were the setting where most of the above issues were confronted. It was agreed that these meetings should be held at different regional Centers both to divide the labor and to provide opportunity for a larger number of persons at each Center to attend at least one such meeting a year. A pattern emerged that any national meeting should strike a balance between necessary work on organizational problems and equally necessary (but always in jeopardy) conceptualization and joint exploration of goals and methods.

A number of program ideas were developed:

1. At Bethel and at Tarrytown staff members gave ten-minute abstracts of papers prepared for the conference and discussants gave brief

reactions to initiate general discussion of the issues raised. The authors then revised their papers which were later published by NTL for COPED.

2. Also at Tarrytown each regional team described its theoretical base and sketched out the kinds of training events it proposed to conduct.

3. The legitimation of work on process also began at the early seminars. At Tarrytown the development of inter-team competitiveness was noted. This precipitated an exploration of how to increase effectiveness by using special competencies without allowing differences to become divisive. It was felt that facing the issue helped set the norm of working on potentially disruptive issues in the formative stages.

   As an alternative to evaluation-competition, each team presented its thinking and asked for challenge and/or support. This served the dual purpose of making each team's thinking and resources known and of providing a forum for testing and improving theory and procedures. Commitment to the norm of using diversity seems natural enough but its effective implementation has depended continually on the consortium's ability to look at the relevant interpersonal issues inherent in such a process. At Tarrytown interpersonal issues were considered in their relationship to program goals; i.e., further development of a theoretical framework, establishment of a management procedure, and the initiation of a research procedure, rather than being ignored or made an end in themselves. Relevant interpersonal and inter-team issues such as autonomy, trust, power, and influence were identified and, to the extent possible, "worked" as they facilitated or inhibited the accomplishment of the consortium's objectives. While the objective of integrating task and maintenance work has not been fully achieved, there was a progressive development toward this goal through the early seminars and it has been a continuing concern.

4. The continual reappraisal of goals was also of particular importance during the early seminars. A Goals Task Force at Greyston led by Paul Buchanan was asked to listen for agreements and disagreements and to use these as a basis for redefining COPED goals. The group identified 26 issues from the first morning's discussion. These became the agenda for cross-center subgroups. Each subgroup was asked to identify goals common to all Centers and those which would more appropriately be allocated to a single Center.

5. Skill in giving and receiving help is a COPED concern--both in training school system change agents and in the operation of the consortium. To illustrate, the task forces on occasion found themselves in difficulties. Conflict could not be resolved satisfactorily and diagnostic discussion turned into tense debates over relatively minor points. In one instance the committee halted work on the substantive task and called in one of the other staff

members as consultant on its own processes of working. During an intense session, it became clear to the members that the issue impeding work was uncertainty over their perceived competence in the consortium. The members represented a range of age and experience but they were relatively new to COPED. Competition for status was draining away energies. The situation was not uncommon. The important thing here was that the staff could step back from the immediate task and focus skills and energies on their own needs for maintenance.

6. An interviewing panel was used effectively at the Boston Conference as a way to help each Center share its current experience. In the process another effective way to give and receive help was developed. It became apparent that the problems the teams were describing in their work with school systems were reflected in the problems they were revealing as a team: e.g., failure to give adequate information to persons who needed to be involved in decisions, failure to face issues of power and control, failure to face up to value differences. This experience precipitated a useful discussion of the importance of consistency between the way the team operates and the way it attempts to help the client operate. The variety of roles the interviewing panel played demonstrated the potential COPED represents for giving needed help. In some instances the panel probed and confronted; in others, helped and supported; in others, clarified. One outcome was continuing work on team process problems between sessions and the decision in at least two cases to ask for continuing help from a panel member.

7. Still another example of process work at a national conference was the use of a "micro lab" at the Chicago Conference to help integrate new members. The conference started with a wide range of interest and with some members apparently uninvolved. A post-meeting reaction sheet supported this observation. A one-hour micro lab was suggested by William Schutz. This was an intensive compression into three ten-minute cycles of a sensitivity training group focused on here-and-now behavior, feelings, and perceptions. This was seen as helpful and some members recommended its use to begin future conferences to speed the process of establishing or re-establishing relationships.

8. An exploration of value issues in COPED was scheduled for the Boston Conference. This began as a dialogue between Kenneth Benne and Ronald Lippitt. This started with the general issue of the ethics and responsibilities inherent in a situation where some persons are attempting to influence others. This led to a discussion of manipulation and implications for freedom and constraint and of openness and training as potential safeguards against manipulatory abuses. Discussion of issues of influence and control became real when the suggestion was made that a micro-lab be substituted for the intended consideration of regional hypotheses and objectives as to their value implications. The micro-lab was not held but there was agreement that in the process of reaching this decision useful work was done on process, on influence, on minority-majority rights, and on

clarification of COPED values. There were differences as to whether a micro-lab was useful at the particular moment. There was no disagreement that process work should be done when the need for it appears. The micro-lab issue demonstrated the capacity of the COPED staff to move from substantive to process concerns and hopefully to integrate the two.

COMMUNICATIONS

COPED could be defined as an attempt to build a communications network to facilitate common tasks--first by sharing and contributing to knowledge about change processes; second to support change efforts aimed at developing within schools attitudes, norms, skills, structures directed toward self-renewal; third to develop and stimulate dialogue about different models for supporting change efforts; and fourth to disseminate results of COPED work. COPED attempted to use a number of devices to facilitate communication and coordination since frequent meetings could not be held because of distance and cost. For example, the Executive Committee "met" from time to time in hour-long telephone conference calls. These were useful in responding to various crises. They were most effective when planned ahead with suggested agenda built and distributed in advance. Some of the Centers acquired conference call amplifiers so that in effect entire committees or teams could be linked in conference calls. This device spread to the Research Council and various task forces and in some cases were used to link the school teams in a geographic center with the university staff team.

Inter-team visitation was another communications device though this was not used as regularly as would have been useful. On occasion, however, members from other teams took part in training activities scheduled in one Center. This opportunity to contribute to and to learn from one another meant that COPED provided direct channels for mutual help and stimulation. Visiting staff played several roles--trainer, observer, consultant.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

A major goal at the first staff conference at Bethel was to begin the task of conceptualizing as the base for planning a program of action research. A secondary goal was to begin to create a working organization. This goal did not have complete reality since funds were still not assured. However, an Executive Committee was tentatively named along with suggested task forces on publications and on a national conference. For the Tarrytown Conference the New York COPED staff team and the coordinator planned the program. It was during the conference that the need for a stronger administrative-steering body to take overall responsibility for coordination was defined. The vacuum, not unlike the leadership vacuum at the start of unstructured training groups, precipitated a discussion of various organizational issues. On the one hand was a clear need for direction and leadership; on the other was a strong desire for autonomy. There was also a commitment to openness. These issues were worked by having the Executive Committee hold what was, in a sense, its first executive session "in the round" --i.e., in an inner circle with the total staff group observing the action from an outer circle and with a general evaluation session at the end. This pattern was to be used at subsequent sessions and when the Research Council came into being it too held its first session "in the round" with the total staff a witness to and, in part, consultants to the process of developing guidelines and work patterns.

The Executive Committee acknowledged issues about control and power at the open session and time was allowed for each Center team to caucus both as to composition of a permanent Executive Committee and as to Committee purposes, responsibilities, and authority. The groups recommended that each team nominate one member and one alternate and that the nominations be approved by the entire consortium. The resulting nominations and approval procedure left the composition of the Committee unchanged but satisfaction with it increased. The Committee was more fully legitimated as a body representing and empowered to act for COPED. The Committee defined its functions in a series of guidelines approved by the total staff as follows:

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FUNCTIONS

1. In overall planning:
    a. To clarify issues requiring decision and action.
    b. To set agendas for plenary sessions.
2. In implementation:
    a. To create structures to get policy dealt with by entire group (policy being defined as covering common operating procedures, contractual agreements and membership in the project).
    b. To enter into binding agreements within project policy.
    c. To be responsible for quality control.
    d. To assume legal responsibility for the project.
    e. To have responsibility for making policy decisions in what the committee may judge to be crisis situations.
    f. To define other functions that may need approval by the entire staff group.

EVOLUTION OF THE RESEARCH COUNCIL

The Research Council has been the second key structure for getting work done. It evolved through a series of steps. An immediate task was to generate cross-regional hypotheses and to devise instruments to gather data. A Measurement Committee chaired by Matthew Miles was formed of those seen as most competent and interested in research from the several teams. Later as the instrument development task was completed, the Measurement Committee became a Continuous Assessment Committee with a Historian or Documentation Committee also named to develop guidelines for and to help coordinate local efforts to collect naturalistic data about change processes in the school systems.

As a Continuous Assessment function a two-man visitation team (Robert Luke and Dale Lake) visited and interviewed each team about their research plans and movement toward the establishment of cross-regional hypotheses. It was important to know the research interests and capabilities of each center and the degree to which each center would be willing to test common hypotheses. This circuit riding revealed the tension between responsibility to do work for the whole and the desire to follow through on interests of more central concern to the local region. The interviews also pointed up some similarities--for example, common commitment to training change agent teams for self-renewal. Each region was attempting to train educational practitioners to become their own diagnosticians, consultants, innovators, and evaluators. The interviewers were struck by the range of special skills among the centers; e.g., skills in identifying resources and making the best use of internal system resources, skills in generating data from within the system and feeding these back as they relate to an internally initiated change effort, training skills on problem analysis, and skills for building more effective teamwork and clearer channels of communication through the medium of sensitivity training. This was clearly the unique strength of the COPED consortium; the regions had differential competencies that all could draw on.

At the same time COPED was conceived as a systematic exploration of change models. This implied a deliberate attempt to use differential training methods in different types of school systems and the need to select different systems using the criteria of size, type (rural-urban-suburban), and past history of change. The hope was that we would arrive at generalizations about the consequences of given interventions under given situations. It was thus important to arrive at a common core of hypotheses, to improve the core package of instruments, and to build in the historian function to describe situational variables.

From the conversations with each region, it became evident that some were more committed to research than others and that some had specific research interests which they wanted to explore, but which were not always centrally related to the core hypotheses. The research issue served as the crystalizing agent around the autonomy issue since the development and testing of common hypotheses was in large part the reason why COPED was funded and the reason why the staff was interested. The resolution of this issue sheds additional light on the emergent-synthesis quality of the consortium's decision-making processes.

The working of this issue became a central concern during the Ann Arbor national seminar in May 1966. The data collected from the interviews were used by the Executive Committee in planning the meeting since the autonomy issue affected all of COPED and was seen as critical. The Executive Committee did not see itself as umpire, deciding which center could do which kind of research, but rather as responsible for developing a process whereby the issue could be explored. The Committee broke the issue into several parts, consideration of the core package, research designs (what kind and how much data should or should not be fed back to systems), the use of control measures, administrative procedures. The Committee then allowed time to explore each of these sub-issues in general session. Task forces were then formed on a volunteer basis to work each issue separately at Ann Arbor with responsibility for an action decision by September. The COPED documentarian noted after the Ann Arbor conference:

> "It appeared that participants feel a greater degree of comfort in living with the dualism which is becoming incorporated into the workings of the national organization. On the one hand, confrontation on various issues affords each center the opportunity for critical testing of its own ideas. On the other hand, there seems to be agreement that nurturance of individual team strategies and the development of cross-regional comparability mutually reinforce one another. For, as each team becomes clearer and more articulate about its plans, every other team has a sharper understanding of its plans. The result is more precise identification of areas of comparability and differences. While we did not really decide on a national research design, we did make strides toward the identification of the real issues on which a realistic decision can be made."

By the Chicago conference in November 1966 it had become commonly accepted that a stronger research arm was needed. The development of the core package was exploratory, given the innovative nature of the program and its scope, rather than being guided by well-formulated hypotheses. The next stage of the research effort, therefore, called for an internal analysis of the core package results to generate identifiable variables and hypotheses. There was also a clearer awareness of the desirability of coordinating the work of the Instrument Committee with that of the Historians. Indeed the potential for integrating instrumental and more naturalistic data in a comprehensive assessment program has emerged as one of the important aspects of COPED. The Executive Committee had selected William Schutz to serve as research coordinator and the Council was formed to work with him at Chicago.

Dr. Schutz asked each team to select one member who was knowledgeable "not just interested" in research. Two members at large were added--Luke from the historian committee and Miles as a senior advisor. The first meeting of the Council was held "in the round," as was the case with the Executive Committee, to begin to formulate its goals and purposes. One immediate issue was the relationship between the Research Council and the Executive Committee--should the Council make research decisions or should the Executive Committee be involved and be able to influence its decisions. The Research Council felt that technical competence should determine research decisions and saw this stance as within COPED's emerging philosophy of competence-based power. Others saw research decisions as crucially affecting program, center autonomy, etc., and therefore a part of the Executive Committee's overall program responsibility. There was also the issue of maintaining the continuing interest and commitment of each center in the work of the Council in view of the fact that not all centers had the same research interests. The researchers gave priority to systematic disciplined efforts to learn. The more action, service-oriented members were fearful that in the interests of a tight research design what could be learned might be limited to trivia. It was finally agreed by the entire staff that the Research Council would attempt to create as rigorous a research design as the diffuse nature and the breadth of the goals permitted and would have a free hand in all technical issues and responsibility for the substantive integration of the research project, while the Executive Committee had ultimate project responsibility and, therefore, ultimate authority. The Research Council could be "impeached" but it would have professional responsibility. As for the inter-team issue, it was felt that since each team had a representative on the Council there would be opportunities for mutual influence and, therefore, little likelihood that one center would strongly disagree with a decision of the Council.

TASK FORCES

Much of the work of the consortium has been done by cross-center task forces in the areas of research, publications, training, coordination, proposal development, and report writing. Insofar as was possible, each center was represented on each cross-center task force. The personal link and opportunity for mutual influence between task forces which made decisions and regional teams who had responsibilities for implementing them seemed crucial. Functional committees staffed by people representing all regions and chosen on the basis of interest and competence was seen as an effective mechanism for safeguarding quality and maintaining individual interest and commitment. The two-way dialogue between decision makers and implementers has been of key importance.

Work by task forces illustrates the COPED norms around personal power, influence, and reward. Under another model, the Executive Committee would have assumed decision-making responsibility and assigned implementation responsibilities to those most interested and competent. Undoubtedly this model might have been more efficient at times. It would not, however, have allowed opportunities for reciprocal influence and, at least at the beginning, central control would probably have been resisted. As it was, people worked on tasks which interested them and over which they had influence which heightened their commitment. Where a task called for a pooling of resources of all centers, as in the development of a core package of research instruments, each center felt central to the task and responsible for implementing decisions made by the group. Communication between centers was face-to-face between representatives, with opportunities for clarification, exploration of alternative action, and confrontation. Actually, the centers did become more ready to accept some degree of control in part, at least, because of a commonly acknowledged need and readiness for some control.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Status and reward and job assignments in COPED have been based on demonstrated competence, interest, and availability rather than on reputation prior to COPED. An important side effect of this was the emergence of a high quality in-service staff development program. For the senior consortium members (the initiators) COPED provided frequent opportunities for collaboration around matters of long concern. For the Tarrytown conference, for instance, five of the leading figures in laboratory education prepared conceptual papers for discussion. All five found the experience stimulating and rewarding. The other papers were authored by recent Ph.D.'s or advanced graduate students alone or in collaboration with a senior writer. For most of the younger group, Tarrytown was a first opportunity to test their wings in a non-student role with senior colleagues. Throughout the first year of COPED, members of this group took on a more and more active role in shaping and implementing the work of the consortium. They served as their center's representative on the Executive Committee, made major contributions to the core package of research instruments, chaired several task forces, and took on major responsibilities for writing continuation proposals.

The Education Intern Program, funded by the Research-Training Branch of the United States Office of Education's Research Bureau and by the Fund for the Advancement of Education of the Ford Foundation and conducted by NTL at Bethel, Maine, in the summer of 1966 with the help of COPED staff, produced yet a "third generation" of COPED. Members of this program were young professors of education and graduate students in the social sciences who took on significant responsibilities for training, research, and administration at each of the centers. Their continuing involvement with the consortium gave them an extended practicum in collaboration and applied social science which not only reinforced and supported their Bethel learnings but made them increasingly valuable to COPED. Perhaps the most satisfying aspect of COPED has been this capacity to become self-renewing. In this respect COPED did succeed in achieving for itself the objectives it was trying to help school systems achieve.

DISSEMINATION

The Publications Task Force published the first two volumes of what may become an ongoing series - Concepts of Social Change and Change in School Systems. There is now discussion of a third volume presenting the hypotheses, strategies for testing these, and case studies of work in school systems. When it is further refined, the core package of instruments to assess change should be a useful tool for a wide variety of educational change programs.

In addition to these published products, COPED has during its two years presented its approaches and experiences in such occasions as the American Educational Research Association conference, the Orthopsychiatric Society, the American Association of School Administrators, the American Psychological Association, and various regional educational and behavioral science meetings. There has been considerable discussion with such groups as the Regional Laboratories of the United States Office of Education. COPED has been discussed also in training programs conducted by the National Training Laboratories. The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education arranged for a COPED staff team to conduct a seminar for Institute and Department of Education staff members.

Perhaps more significant has been the spread of COPED experience through "spin offs" in the form of projects generated by COPED staff in other systems. Brevard County, Florida schools for example, has become a full fledged member of COPED with support under Title III for the next three years. Dale Lake, first of the New York team and now of the Boston team, has been consultant to the system. Robert Chasnoff of the New York team through a contract between the South Brunswick, New Jersey schools and NTL has disseminated COPED concepts and approaches. The Michigan COPED team is working in similar ways in Bloomfield Hills.

THE SWORD OF DAMOCLES

This chapter could not be concluded without a word about the frustration generated by consistent uncertainty about funding. While individuals assigned to work with us at the United States Office of Education have been helpful, sympathetic, and concerned, we have had to devote a considerable part of our energies to contingency planning, uncertainties about staffing, and writing and defending proposals. At times our alternatives have been to dismiss qualified, enthusiastic staff who are badly needed for the program, ask them to risk not being paid or not being re-employed (in November!), or ask the university or school system to risk not being reimbursed for the months preceding approval or renewal of contract. The last is generally impossible under institutional policy though in at least one instance the university has used overhead payments to cover ongoing staff costs. We have tended to allow the individual to risk unemployment. In other instances staff members whose special resources were badly needed have been forced to take other assignments and then to crowd into their schedule some essential help to COPED.

We do not make this complaint without awareness of the complexity of federal funding. Certainly the problems are generated by forces outside the control of the USOE staff. We register these reactions because of a genuine concern that the system providing financial support does create frustration and does at times foster mediocrity of staff. Planned change in education at any significant level is, under the best of circumstances, beset with difficulties. It is unfortunate that the support system compounds the problems. One of the costly problems has been the necessity to seek funds each year. A yearly review against defined and agreed upon standards is obviously desirable. Year to year survival is wasteful of potential improvement resources. Delay in approvals has also created difficulties.

SOME CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Have gains justified the costs of creating a consortium? One way to answer is to review the forces that have kept COPED together and those that have threatened it. The consortium has been encouraged by a common sense of need, some common values about participation and growth, some shared assumptions about the potential for university-school system collaboration, the mutual stimulation and challenge of working across regional lines and sharing diverse resources, and some shared commitment to action research as "a way of life." Forces that have had to be overcome have included concern that autonomy would be lost, that the cost in time and money would be too great, that watered down compromise would result when difficult issues arose. If funding had not been so continuing a source of uncertainty and anxiety, the practical values would clearly, we believe, outweigh the costs. The measurement packet, for example, was produced by pooling a wide range of knowledge, competence, experience, approaches not available on any one campus. The joint intern program has also demonstrated that collaboration could achieve a program not otherwise possible. The conceptual work, while it was threatened by organizational tasks, was exhilarating and stimulating. The potential for innovative approaches to cross center communication and coordination was demonstrated if not fully realized. Certainly the potential of the consortium as a mechanism for staff development and for quickly moving junior staff into colleagueship was realized.

The fact that COPED has survived and accomplished at least some of its major objectives thus far is a tribute to the stamina and commitment of the staff, to the vitality and appeal of the program and its objectives, and to the inherent soundness of the concept of federal support of efforts to improve education. The staff members could have been involved in many of the same activities that COPED has generated by staying within their own centers and foregoing the costs of attempting to collaborate across distance and differences of approach. COPED excited and challenged interests and people have stuck with it past the call of duty. The incentive has been a more creative and a richer response to educational change needs than any could have achieved alone.

Ultimately, the value of COPED will lie in how much we will have learned and disseminated about how educational change is brought about. Full answers to this cannot be made until the third year is completed. We are now awaiting confirmation of funds for this year.

December 1967

CASE STUDIES

BOSTON REGIONAL CENTER

Elmer E. Van Egmond

The following Case materials provide a summary of the COPED experience for the four school systems included in the Boston Regional Center's program. For each system, information is provided about the community, the school system, the entry procedure employed, essential elements of the program of intervention, and an assessment of the degree of involvement in the program and short-term consequences of COPED interventions.

The five systems were selected to provide a wide variation in type and size of community and school system, support for education, and extent of program involvement in educational change and innovation. The entry procedure employed in all except one of the school systems described in the case study materials followed the same general pattern.

Initial contact was made by a member of the project staff with a member of the school system which the staff person knew through a previous working relationship. Following these initial discussions, ratification of the working agreement was then obtained through the superintendents' office and approved by the school committee of the city or town.

An exception to this pattern was the Hancock School System. Representatives from the School System contacted members of the COPED staff to request help in implementing a change program which they had described in a working paper. In responding to this request, the COPED staff agreed to begin intervention activities in the Hancock School System nine months earlier than in the other school systems.

The programs of intervention differed in degree of intensity and amount of service provided. For three School Systems, the intervention was limited to a change-agent team from the school system participating in a series of bi-monthly change-agent seminars and in consultation on change programs which the team designed for their own school system (in addition to data collection activities). The COPED staff intervented intensively in two situations, a single elementary building case and an entire school system. In both situations, involvement in training programs, consultation and intervention activity included all or a substantial portion of the teaching and administrative staff of the school building or school system.

Because the formal intervention program by COPED staff ended with the termination of funding, school systems have varied in the degree to which self-renewal activities have continued. The difference is in direct relation to the extent and intensity of the COPED intervention program. In the two school systems where intervention was minimal, (change agent team seminars and consultation) efforts to change seem to have stopped.

Only in the Franklin system has subsequent work been done with the high school faculty and central office staff in terms of occasional training programs and consultation from outside sources.

The two school systems involved in the intensive intervention effort provide a marked contrast. Members of the school system have initiated change efforts on their own and requested consultation in planning efforts in short-term training programs. In the Hancock School System, requests for consultation and training programs have come from various levels and parts of the school system for a variety of projects and activities. Requests for consultation and training programs directed to members of the COPED staff indicate development of a high degree of sophistication in the use of consultant help for planning, problem solving, and implementing desired programs and training events.

Generally, the same pattern or behavior occurs at the Revere School in the Jefferson School System. The principal and staff members have continued to engage in a number of change projects and self-renewing activities. For example, the building staff has held several week-end retreats for purposes of planning, training and systematic attention to problem solving. During the summers of 1968 and 1969, subsequent to termination of the COPED intervention effort, selected members of the teaching staff participated in a program sponsored by the National Training Laboratories at Bethel, Maine and supported by the Office of Education, in the improvement of teacher education.

As participant members in a consortion, including five school systems and teacher training institutions, teachers participated in training programs involving work with other teachers, student teachers, faculty members from departments of education, children and parents. Action projects developing from this involvement include a cross-age learning program, human relations training programs for teachers at various levels in the school system, and programs of consultation and program development leading to change and innovation in several areas.

Although the case descriptions will not provide documentation of post - COPED activities in the five school systems, they may provide clues which help to explain why continuing self-renewal activity has been more prominently evident in two of the four school systems included in the Boston Regional COPED program.

For the school system as a whole, a unique structure was developed as an outcome of contract negotiations. "...we think these two committees represent two things new and different in education and another extention of the kinds of things we are trying to do. We'll have one committee composed of 6 members appointed by the school committee, citizens they felt would be interested to work on educational conditions. A second committee consists of 6 appointed by the teachers association and 6 by the school committee to work on educational improvements and accommodations.

So we are bringing together citizens of this community and teachers to work together for the improvement of teachers conditions and education... The fact that we were able to arrive at the decisions of these two committees is in line with and an outgrowth of the other activities relating to COPED."

"...so that is in our contract and was something that did evolve from our COPED work. Everybody on our negotiating team was involved in COPED."

A more general, system-wide effect of COPED interventions was related to an improvement in the climate for communication, the degree of openness for ideas and the attitude of teachers toward innovation and change in their classroom work.

"...I think we have found ways to of letting people make suggestions. Looking back on my own experience, I have the feeling that the reaction of an administrator to a new idea is to respond by finding what's wrong with it. We have used the brainstorming idea. We do not always practice it, but we try to. When someone suggests something, we do stay with it in a positive sort of way until we've had a good opportunity to explore it and at this point we really test it after we've pushed it as far as we can."

"Some of the teachers who responded to administration three years ago in a defensive way have changed and see concern that we understand your problems and we're willing to work this through with you. So both teachers and administrators have changed. ...COPED had an effect directly on teachers primarily in that the teachers were shown that the administrators are more open to the new suggestions, new ideas, more receptive."

"Well, there's more belief that the Administration is willing to listen to teachers, I don't know whether we've established trust yet or not. We're working on it. We're facing it anyway. And this is all we can do, give it a go, as they say. ...the administrators will listen a little differently. I think they always were willing to listen, it's just, they're more aware, I think, of the difficulties in change and in communicating with people. A lot more aware of it than we were.... The administrators thought, well, my door is always open, you know? They must be talking about another school, they're not talking about my school. And they're talking about people who can't talk with the administrator, you know. I think that they thought it over a bit and listened to some of these things, they got around to thinking, 'yeah, gee, might be my school.' Instead of just saying the door is open and let it go at that, they started to walk through the door."

"One tangible thing was that we were running a program with Project (1) on guidance and we were wondering whether it was working right, or it wasn't and so forth. We decided that we'd call people from Project (1), people from the headquarters guidance staff, and we'd all sit down and talk about it instead of standing up in the teachers' room and complaining about it. ...and I don't think this would have happened without the climate established by COPED. I don't think that they would have felt that what they said would have mattered that much and I don't think they would have felt free enough to even suggest such a thing in the first place. ...it was just one of those things - we never would have thought of it, I don't think two years ago. We would have stayed in the teachers' room and said this and that and the other thing but it never would have occurred to us, 'Well, gee, let's go to the source and straighten it out'. Then everybody, you know, some very busy people high up came down and sat down and listened to us. I don't think this would have happened two years ago."

"Oh, I've found out that just because I think all these things are marvelous, I just don't hit people over the head with them. I have to convince them in other ways. And, as I listen to other people, maybe some of the things I thought were so marvelous really aren't. ...I tried very hard to make it a two-way street. I thought I was making it a two-way street before, but I, you know, found out that I was just standing there telling them how wonderful it was."

"Yes, I am sure that the teachers are more receptive to ideas, they are getting more ideas on their own. More people are reading, and recognizing that school systems have to move forward and have a real desire that this school system be one of those in the forefront."

"I would think in the elementary schools, now that teachers know they have the approval of the school administration, many more of them might have been trying out these things who had never tried out anything before."

"Well, to be quite honest, I suppose that the only perceptible changes that you can see are in the classrooms of teachers that you already knew were of the type who would want to change and try out new things. These teachers probably would have done it anyway, but now, of course - they feel much freer to do it."

"...through the exchange of ideas like this, yes, I think people have tried techniques. I know that people have tried techniques that they've seen, for instance, the two circles-type-thing has been tried in a lot of classrooms, and some of the behavioral techniques that they're role-playing. Teachers have told me that they took part in role-playing up there (training workshop) or they saw it and they tried it in their classrooms, and also some of these other communicative techniques that were used up there. They have. Yes. They've tried it."

"The breakdown of the groups had been such that the people came from various parts of the whole school system, so that, you got to understand the problems that other people have, and you discover that you're not all alone. I think this has been very good, so that the people who have been interested in change now have a good network, and there's a good nucleus. ...before, I mean, there might have been various teachers who might have been interested, but they didn't know other teachers who were interested in trying out things."

"In some cases, it's gotten to the students, I'd say in cases. I think anything that makes a teacher a better teacher gets to the student level. And I think that COPED, the whole purpose is to make a good teacher a better teacher. And if we've accomplished this, then we can't help but get to the students, which is the point behind the whole thing."

One of the over arching goals of the COPED program was to work toward the development of a self-renewing system. The comments of the respondents indicate both understanding of this concept and commitment to making it operational in the future.

"We need to be self-renewing people. We need to first change ourselves if we are going to expect children to change as individuals. If we expect children to pursue a learning program that is self renewing where they are life-time learners, then we better take a look at our own kinds of behavior and be sure that we get our behavior oriented to the kind of youngsters we are trying to educate."

"Well, I think self-renewal is more or less a frame of reference that you are willing at all times to listen and to try to understand about new kinds of things, and that you have an open mind, because things do change and, very often, you need new methods. Maybe our ideals don't change, but the ways of effectively getting these things into practice or getting them into effect in a system, these methods can be changed. And I think primarily that's what it's about. You should be reading all the time and keeping up, because if you don't, then you aren't aware of the changes that are occurring in society."

"...with all the changes going on now in our society, the school cannot necessarily be or accept the status quo or that which is. Rather, the school has to take the approach of an agent, one of the agents of society's cultural change and the only way the teachers can do that is if they are capable of handling change and if they can be self-renewing individuals. If they aren't self-renewing individuals, then the school system cannot be self-renewing collectively."

"Yes, I think that in-service training programs will be a lot different. I think they'll be based on this type of thing. And I think teacher negotiations in the future will be better because teachers and administrators will have had the chance to deal with one another before, under these circumstances. I think that the changes that do come about through things like ES-70 and so forth will be much better because they'll be thrashed over on a more horizontal level before decisions are made in the future."

"...teachers will have more opportunity to be involved in the plans, and this will make the difference. This is what we've learned, from COPED, that everybody has learned to see that you have to practice what you preach, too."

"Because we had done it this way, because we have learned to work together in these ways, putting things on the table, I am hopeful that the outcome, as we move into this next year, will be far more productive... I think we have made progress and have continued to move. We have had enough training and experience that I am confident we will continue to develop and move forward."

"...I think when you get intelligent, enthusiastic people, the type of person you find in teaching together and bring things out in the open, you don't get a withdrawal. You get a committment to go on. I think this is what we were looking for in COPED and I think this is what we started to get."

Hancock

Introduction

Hancock is a city of about 90,000 people located on the long shoreline of a bay just south of Boston. It is a city with a long historical tradition, a tradition closely associated with the politically and intellectually powerful Adams family. In recent years, however, it has come to be just one of many manufacturing and retailing suburbs in the Boston metropolitan area.

Most of the population growth occurred in the 1910's and 1920's. As the table below indicates, the growth has diminished in rate since World War II and perhaps has even terminated. In 1960, 35.2 per cent of the city's population was under 20 years old, and the median age of persons residing in the city was 32.5. Non-whites comprised only 0.2 per cent of the city's 1960 population, an extremely low percentage given the amount of industry in the community.

Absolute and Percentage Growth of the Population
1940-1965

Year	Population	Actual Growth	Percentage Growth
1940	75,810		
		6,274	8.3
1945	82,084		
		1,751	2.1
1950	83,835		
		660	0.8
1955	84,495		
		2,914	3.4
1960	87,409		
		- 252	-0.3
1965	87,158		
1940 - 1965		11,348	15.0

Sources: U.S. Census of Population
Massachusetts Census of Population.

The median number of school years completed by persons 25 years old and older in 1960 was 12.1 years. Of this same population group, only 53.5 per cent had completed high school, while 3.3 per cent had completed less than five grades. Of the employed 1960 residents, only 20.9 per cent were engaged in professional, technical, managerial or proprietary occupations. Median family income in 1960 was $6,785, with 19 per cent of families having incomes of $10,000 and over, and 9.4 per cent of families having incomes under $3,000.

Of the housing units in Hancock in 1960, 15,854 or 58 per cent were single family dwellings. The median value of these single family homes, according to the 1960 census of owner estimates, was $13,900. The median 1960 rent in flats and apartments was $86.00.

These education, income and housing data combine to describe Hancock as a working and lower middle class manufacturing and retailing community. It is by no means merely a bedroom suburb for nearby Boston.

Hancock is governed under a Mayor-Council form of government. The mayor and nine members of the City Council are elected on a non-partisan ballot. The schools are governed by a seven-member school committee, the chairman of which is the mayor. The other six members are elected on a non-partisan basis. The school budget, after approval by the school committee, is debated and approved but never cut by the City Council.

The actual property tax rates in Hancock have risen very slightly over the last five years, and the tax levy per capita has increased by about 18 per cent over the same period. In 1966 the tax rate on $1,000 of assessed valuation was $88.20, while the actual tax rate, that on $1,000 of full equalized valuation, was $31.29. The total debt of the city, as of January 1, 1964, was $11,145,000, or $127.50 per capita (1960).

Hancock Taxes: Rates on $1,000 of Assessed and Full Equalized Valuation, Levies Raised and Levy per capita (1960) - 1962-66

	Assessed Valuation	Stated Tax Rate	Full Equalized Valuation	Actual Tax Rate[1]	Tax Levy	Tax Levy per capita (1960)[2]
1962	$181,306,125	$77.30	$456,619,200[3]	$30.81	$14,066,684	$160.93
1963	182,533,325	79.50	492,100,000[4]	29.59	14,562,088	166.60
1964	183,917,350	83.50	492,100,000[4]	31.57	15,537,124	175.69
1965	185,063,725	89.20	530,000,000[5]	31.15	16,507,684	188.86
1966	188,010,425	88.20	530,000,000[5]	31.29	16,582,523	189.71

[1] Calculated by dividing the tax levy by the full equalized valuation.
[2] All per capita 1960 data are based on the U.S. Census of Population.
[3] Based on 1961 State Report.
[4] Based on 1963 State Report.
[5] Based on 1965 State Report.

Sources: Files of the Massachusetts Taxpayers Federation. Reports of the State Tax Commission Upon the Equalization and Apportionment of State and County Taxes.

Hancock has 22 elementary schools, five junior high schools, and two senior high schools. Until 1967 it had only one small vocational school with a maximum capacity of 300, but a new vocational school for 1100 pupils was opened in the fall of 1967. The system also has a junior college, physically attached to one of the high schools, which enrolls 1,200 students, of whom 434 attend full time. Less than 25% of the Hancock high school graduates go on to attend a four-year college, and according to estimates by the Superintendent, half of those do not complete their college course. Another 18% of the high school graduates attend junior colleges, various technical schools or nurses training institutions after high school. Nonetheless, close to

60 per cent of the graduates terminate their education with the completion of high school. A study conducted by the National Education Association for the office of Manpower Policy, U.S. Department of Labor, stated that this group, with "no vocational or technical preparation," was "ill-equipped for skilled work" and that Hancock's educational planning had "glaring gaps."[1]

The educational plant is not modern. Most of the schools were constructed before World War II and, although enough extra pupils to fill 32 classrooms have enrolled since 1960, no new elementary schools have been built since that time.

Hancock School System Data: Total Enrollment, Number of Teachers, Pupil-Teacher Ratio, Expenditures per Pupil in Net Average Membership, Minimum and Maximum Teachers' Salaries.
1962-1966

Year	Total Enrollment	Number of Teachers	Pupil-Teacher Ratio	Expenditures per Pupil NAM	Teachers' Salaries	
					Min.	Max.
1962-3	15,185	661	23.0	$456	$4,500	$8,000
1963-4	15,413	665	23.2	464	4,750	8,400
1964-5	15,514	646[1]	24.0[1]	497	5,000	8,900
1965-6	15,302	684	22.4	519	5,100	9,078
1966-7	15,558	NA	NA	NA	5,500	9,790

[1] Possibly an error in the data

Sources: Files of the Massachusetts Teacher Association
Files of the Massachusetts State Department of Education.

A study of school building needs by a Boston area company in 1965-66 recommended the expenditure of $17 million for new elementary schools, additions to standing elementary schools and the reorganization of the junior high schools on a grades five through eight "middle-school" basis. However, such a school building program, for financial reasons, appears to be at least seven or eight years away.

---

[1] "Adapting Educational Change to Manpower Needs in Massachusetts and Wood County (Parkersburg), West Virginia", an Action Research Study under the direction of the Automation Project of the National Education Association of the United States 1964-66, supported by the Office of Manpower Policy, U.S. Department of Labor .

The present superintendent works well with the Mayor and the School Committee and has been able to obtain adequate budget support. The composition of the present School Committee is the same as that of 1963 which selected the current superintendent, and relations are very close. The City Council does have the right to pass on the capital budget, however, and money is not always easy to raise. The Federal Study states that Hancock, "with a rather slowly rising assessed valuation, and with one of the lowest state support rates for public schools...found itself seriously handicapped in implementing innovations calling for added outlays." More important, the superintendent has been told by the City Countil to "go slow",[2] to wait until completion of the vocational high school now under construction before submitting an ambitious building program on the elementary or junior high school levels.

Attracting high quality teaching personnel is another problem in Hancock. Some of the difficulty is unavoidable. The nature of the student body does not attract teachers who are interested in the academically talented student. The distance between Hancock and the major centers of learning in the area is such that the large pool of wives of professional men and graduate students do not find it convenient to seek employment in the system. Furthermore, Hancock had lagged behind other systems in salaries. In the spring of 1966, after a certain amount of conflict, a contract was drawn up for 1966-67 between the City of Hancock and the Hancock Teachers Association, providing for a competitive basic salary of $5,900. The maximum salary for teachers with 30 semester hours past a Master's degree is now $10,500. Department chairmen receive a maximum differential of $700, and senior administrators such as high school principals and the president of the Junior College, receive an effective maximum index of about 1.40. Given the prevailing wage pattern, it is not surprising that relatively few supervisors have come to Hancock from outside the system. The policy of the schools, moreover, is to encourage the growth of administrative talent among teachers already in the system and to promote from within where possible.

The progress made by the Hancock schools must be measured against the ineluctable handicaps mentioned in these pages. For nineteen years, from 1944-1963, the superintendent was a conservative educator who built a like-minded central office staff. The two key officials under the superintendent were the assistant superintendent for Business and Plant, whose duties were to run things as economically as possible, and an Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, whose responsibilities in the area of personnel and detailed administration were so extensive as to leave him a very limited amount of time to work on curriculum innovation or fundamental educational policy.

When this superintendent retired, the school committee decided that a new superintendent should be one who will bring change to the system. The atmosphere was favorable; the Chamber of Commerce and the Taxpayers' Association wanted good schools and were willing to pay for them. The School Committee knew that the school system was not as good as some local residents complacently thought. There was sentiment that the school system should be "on the go", move closer to the educational "frontier" and try in some respects to "outdo" other highly regarded suburban systems. The new choice for superintendent, then Associate Director of the University of Chicago Laboratory Schools, had had seven years experience as a superintedent in a Chicago suburb and was now interested in moving to a bigger system. In four years, the superintendent has compensated for the financial difficulties of the system by attracting federal funds for a variety of projects. Support has been attracted for a wide range of innovations. Private foundations have been solicited as well. In the two years 1964-66 for which figures are available, Hancock schools secured $2,593,428 from outside sources -- a substantial amount of support in relation to the annual budget appropriation of $8,500,000.

---

[2] Ibid., p. 11

In the years since coming to Hancock, the superintendent has achieved substantial decentralization of responsibility and control in the school system. He has done this primarily for tactical purposes, in order to lessen the influence of a central staff resistant to innovation and of relatively ineffective curriculum directors. The superintendent felt that improvement in the system could best be achieved by according a wide degree of autonomy to individual principals. Under the prior administration reforms were timid; the "new math" for example, had been introduced for the top third of the seventh grade on a schedule which would have required eighteen years to spread to the entire system. Under the new approach, talented administrators of individual schools could innovate at their own rate. One of the effects of this approach, for example, is "Project Search." An elementary school principal wished to organize a progress-oriented school which would include an ungraded system. He found that one could not have an ungraded system without materials speaking to individual needs. So, with the cooperation of fifty teachers who worked on their own time, appropriate units of material were developed to meet students' individual needs.

The trend toward autonomy of principals is now in the process of being reversed. The elementary school principals themselves have recognized that autonomy is presently too broad to allow for system-wide sequential development. They want leadership from the top. At the same time, the superintendent's office, and also the consultant on secondary instruction, have felt that the present system allows high school department heads too much latitude. The relations between the present curriculum committee and high school department heads have not always been good and occasionally the department heads have been "by-passed." The department heads, who on the whole have been in the Hancock system for over a generation, are accepted as being very capable educators but tend to be "fact" rather than "concept" oriented. As the superintendent stated it, "They do not emphasize problem-solving, discovery, and self-learning." In short, they have "failed to see the irrelevance of some of the old things they have tried to do." The junior high schools are lagging in educational reform. While the main thrust of system-wide planning has been in the high schools, particularly on vocational education, and while individual principals in the elementary division have made innovations, little progress has been made in the junior high division toward introducing the desired "middle level" concepts which have been successful elsewhere.

At the present time, a new central curriculum committee is being formed. This new "curriculum leadership" group will be headed by the administrative assistant to the superintendent, and will correlate all the diverse efforts at curriculum reform within the system. It will report directly to the superintendent. This team will attempt to work both on the K-12 curriculum (vertically) and on programs to meet different levels of ability within each division (horizontally). The superintendent has emphasized that there is no intention to return to a strict system of central office direction; efforts at innovation at a local level will be welcomed.

The superintendent has emphasized the need for increasing communication at all levels within the system. He holds monthly meetings with his "administrative group" which includes the principals, the directors of curriculum areas and other key officials.

The elementary school principals meet as a group on a monthly basis to discuss current problems, and often the superintendent joins them. The secondary school principals, a smaller group, have a similar institution. The superintendent has also instituted periodic meetings with the executive board of the Hancock Teachers Association, which has come to serve as a faculty advisory council on a wide range of professional matters.

The contract negotiated in March 1967 between the School Committee and the Hancock Teachers Association covers educational matters as well as wages and employment conditions. The contract states that the professional staff should be a "major source of developments and innovations in improving the educational programs" and sets up an Educational Development Committee with one half of the members named by the Teachers Association and one half by the School Committee. The teachers are also to be consulted on textbooks, related educational programs, and conditions of professional service and development. The superintendent conceded that the Teachers Association, through the contract, has forced him to move somewhat faster in involving teachers in decision-making than he had originally expected. Nevertheless, he welcomed the general development along this line, which is fully consistent with his approach to education. In spite of certain difficulties in adopting collective bargaining, the involvement of the Hancock Teachers Association in educational matters has been judged favorably at all levels in the system. Resistance to past innovation, according to the superintendent, had often come because the lower levels of the system were not involved in development of plans. The Teachers Association can serve, with several other system organizations, as a way to involve people at all levels in planning and to pave the way for substantive innovations, especially by recognizing and coping with human relations problems. It is not possible to give a detailed account of the role of numerous organizations which have been working toward facilitated communication within the system, but curriculum committees, the trade and technical advisory committee, the Junior College Development Council, the Parent-Teacher Council, the Community Action Council, as well as numerous teacher and citizen committees and task forces concerned with limited projects, have all been active.

A major problem faced in the curriculum field in recent years has been the upgrading of the vocational curriculum on the secondary school level. The vocational school, until the fall of 1967, with a maximum capacity of 300, an "elite" institution, which trained only 5.5% of the high school graduates. Studies have shown that although 75% of ninth-graders in Hancock indicate that they want to go to college, only 40% of this group do go on to some type of higher education. Under the previous system of vocational education, relatively little was done for pupils who changed their goals and needed training which would enable them to make a living when they graduated. There was a rigid track system in the high schools. The result was that aside from college-bound youngsters and the highly motivated minority which had chosen from the beginning to follow a vocational course, there was no curriculum suitable for a large group of pupils. They were offered a "watered-down" version of the academic course which did not prepare them for skilled positions after graduation. At the same time, there was a high demand for skilled labor from Hancock industrial firms. These industrial firms gave assurance of strong support to an effort by the school system to provide them with a greater flow of skilled labor. The problem for the superintendent was to design a program which would have an "image" which could compete favorably with academic programs for the interest of the pupils. Also to be considered were certain vested interests, including that of the Director of Vocational Education, which would be directly affected by any modifications of the traditional program of the elite vocational school.

The superintendent obtained School Committee approval to invite the American Institute for Research to participate in a curriculum research project called "Development and Evaluation of an Experimental Curriculum for the New Hancock Vocational Technical School." The code name for the project was "ABLE." Funds were obtained for a five-year period to develop a program to tailor curriculum in the vocational area to the individual needs of students. The planning stressed "flexibility," "relevance," "individual differences," "breadth of educational experience" and "guidance." A Committee of Nine (including all the major administrators concerned with secondary education) was formed to implement Project Able.

Planning for Project Able is well advanced. An ultra-modern plant has been opened in September, 1967 accommodating 1,100 secondary and post-secondary people, including junior college students and out-of-school adults who want retraining or vocational course offerings. The vocational school is part of a complex that includes the senior high school and the junior college. This has been done to facilitate interchange of staff and equipment and to allow vocational students to take academic courses in the adjacent buildings. The emphasis is to be on individual progress; no tracking is envisioned. Instead of concentrating on the immediately marketable skills stressed by the old system of vocational education, the new school will stress "generalized" skills, broader training in eleven "job families." The theory is that after such concept-oriented vocational experience, students will be better prepared for specialized training either at the junior college, in grades 13-14 or in on-the-job training. Experience will show to what extent generalized skills can be taught before practical skills are mastered, and the intention is to maintain a flexible attitude. The experimental nature of the curriculum, scheduling, space utilization, student guidance, and the skills development center means that a heavy burden of adjustment will be put on the teachers who operate this complex. The superintendent is well aware of this and plans are being made to ease the problems which will arise.

The new vocational school will have a marked effect on Hancock Junior College, which has evolved from a small liberal arts institution to a comprehensive community junior college. Most of the course offerings are scheduled in the afternoon and evening and are accessible to those employed by day.

An outgrowth of Project ABLE is "Project Plan." This is an attempt to use a computer to record data on learners and on proficiency of learning, in an effort to build a set of relevant learning materials that "speak to a range of abilities and learning styles." The ultimate aim is to assist teachers in tailoring their instruction to the best learning sequences for particular students. A direct hookup with a computer has been arranged. Data on proficiency measures, materials and students are now being recorded for grades 1, 5 and 9 for four subject areas. This project has been funded by an industrial corporation, and a twenty-year follow-up study has been planned to test the effectiveness of the program. An attempt is now being made to obtain Federal support to add a teacher training dimension to this program.

The Hancock school system has accepted an invitation from the U.S. Office of Education to be one of fifteen system in the country to develop an "organic curriculum" for education in the 1970's. The superintendent is currently consulting on details of the program with the U.S. Office of Education and with the State Commissioner of Education. "ES-70", as the program is called, intends to develop new programs and train teachers to operate them. The fifteen school systems will work together to find material most relevant in speaking to "individual need styles," in the use of technological inventions and advances in education and in the retraining of teachers.

Federal funds have also been used in the last two or three years for many other purposes in Hancock schools. Materials have been acquired for the vocational school; a summer work-study program was instituted in vocational areas; the business education curriculum has been upgraded by acquisition of data processing equipment and multiple listening devices for teaching shorthand. In addition, equipment and materials have been acquired in reading, history, geography and science under the critical subjects provisions of the National Defense Education Act. The guidance program has been strengthened at the secondary level through the use of Federal funds and a Federal grant was obtained to strengthen its program in adult literacy and basic education. In the summers of 1965 and 1966, Hancock participated in Project Head Start for deprived pre-school children. The Neighborhood Youth Corps has been active in assisting economically deprived teenagers to procure meaningful jobs. A program to apply the team approach in diagnosis and correction of learning problems has been instituted with the purpose of expanding reading, guidance and physical education services to correct learning problems of a selected number of educationally disadvantaged elementary school children. A program of diagnosis, guidance and education for handicapped children has also been adopted. The system conducted a summer educational institute for educationally disadvantaged youths and pre-school children. Finally, a program to provide work opportunities for 60 Junior College students was established.

In conclusion, it is clear that the Hancock school system, on its own, has moved vigorously in the last four years to meet the needs of the particular community it serves. Through its stress on innovation it has been able to acquire the Federal funds necessary to support a wide range of programs. The history of COPED intervention in Hancock must be evaluated in light of these general trends of innovation and progress under the present administration.

Hancock and COPED

In the fall of 1965 the superintedent was confronted with pressures from two of his advisory groups: the principals advisory group and a teachers advisory group. The latter was essentially an organ of the Teachers Association. The pressure from the principals took the form of a request for additional clerical aides in their offices. At the superintendent's urging, however, the principals agreed to establish a committee and draw up a proposal for dealing with the kinds of educational programs they wished to becomed involved with. The concern was thus to be professional rather than merely administrative. The teachers' advisory group met with the superintendent and transmitted the traditional staff complaints, particularly those dealing with working conditions. His response to the teachers, as it had been to the principals, was to issue a challenge to them to deal with more "professional issues." One member of the teachers group, the president of the Teachers Association, took this challenge seriously and gathered a committee to develop a proposal for teacher-initiated reform in the Hancock school system.

The superintendent received the proposals from the two groups and saw great similarities in them, and urged the groups to combine their efforts. He also suggested that they contact a staff member of the Human Relations Center of Boston University for outside consultant help. A joint committee was formed, a proposal drafted, approved by the two groups and submitted to the consultant. The conceptual framework of this document remarkably paralleled that of COPED, with which the consultant had become involved. At a time when COPED network members were themselves only conceptualizing their plans for intervention in school systems, it was a happy coincidence that the Hancock proposal contained similar concepts, vocabulary and approaches: "climate of change", "Human Relations Team", "self-renewal", "group dynamics", "resistance to change" and all-day and weekend off-site meetings for training purposes were only some of the elements the proposal had in common with COPED conceptualization.

Seeing the similarity of purpose between the Hancock proposal and COPED intentions for action research the following year, the proposal was brought to the attention of the COPED project director. Discussions between the COPED staff and Hancock were held in December and January to consider the possibility of inviting the Hancock system to become a COPED participant. This relationship was formalized in January, 1966. In effect, Boston COPED had committed itself to begin its interventions in one school system nine months before the scheduled date of the intervention phase of the project. The opportunity in Hancock was too good to pass up.

The first COPED intervention in Hancock in the spring of 1966, closely followed the suggestion of the Hancock proposal. These suggestion included separate day-long meetings for administrators and for "selected teacher leadership", followed by a two-day seminar bringing the two groups together. In broad outline this strategy was accepted by the COPED staff.

On February 10, 1966 COPED entered Hancock for the first time, by means of a meeting between the COPED staff and forty teachers. These teachers represented every building the system and were selected by a committee of the Hancock Teachers Association (HTA) on the basis of "status leadership" within each building. Roughly speaking, one participant was chosen for each twenty faculty members in the system. The principal objectives of this first meeting were (1) to establish two-day communication between teachers and COPED, thus creating an environment of honest and free exchange of ideas and feelings; (2) to give Hancock teachers an opportunity to see the sincerity of the COPED staff and to remove the possibility of an image of the staff as outside manipulators; (3) to gather information about past innovations in the system; (4) to learn what change teachers would like to see in the future; (5) to convey to teachers that COPED itself is flexible and open to change; (6) to help teachers learn to analyze their own experiences, and to be open for personal growth as well as to be able objectively and with an open mind to represent their buildings; and (7) to begin the process of sensitivity training and collaborative problem-solving.

To accomplish these ends a program for the day was devised between COPED staff and a planning committee from Hancock. The design included small work groups, general sessions with reports from work groups, and demonstrations by COPED staff of interviewing techniques. Also, questionnaires were circulated to collect data on the concerns, expectations, hopes and fears of participants with a commitment to share this data with participants.

On February 28, 1966 a similar meeting was held with administrators from Hancock. One important issue in planning for this meeting was whether the superintendent should attend. Would his presence inhibit the productivity of the session? At a planning meeting on February 14th, the planning committee discussed this issue and decided that "In terms of our long range goals of creating a climate of openness and freedom in communication, it would seem that the superintendent should be there."

At the February 28 meeting, in order to support the administrators sufficiently to enable them to bring their complaints into the open, it was decided to focus attention and training on the multiple pressures on administrators to reveal their "invisible committees", to show how the expectations of peers, of students, of community, of the superintendent, and finally of the alter-ego, exert pressure on the administrator. Following a training demonstration, the group was charged to think about the choices they make daily and how conflicts influenced their decisions. This training was intended to focus on the diagnosis of personal role problems daily confronting every individual.

At both of the initial meetings, a major topic of discussion was the nature of self-renewal. While these discussion produced no clear and all-encompassing definition, they at least served to introduce the concept to the Hancock staff and to acquaint them with the style and aims of the COPED staff.

The follow-up conference to the separate February meetings of teachers and principals was held on April 1 and 2, 1966. Forty-two administrators, forty-six teachers, and eleven COPED trainers attended this two-day meeting. The primary purpose of this meeting was to bring together the two groups that had examined their separate positions in February. The specific objectives articulated for this meeting in a planning session on March 17, 1966 included: (1) to find common objectives which the administrators and teachers can collaborate on and act; (2) to clarify roles and discover the differences in the perceptions of the administrators and the teachers; (3) to focus on two kinds of issues between the principals and teachers, notably, (a) what kinds of ideas get processed where? and (b) who has the power to produce what? that is, the initiation and the control of innovations; (4) to clarify the objectives of the project and identify areas where it was necessary for the setting of goals; and (5) to search out and find the structural and organizational resistances to change.

To accomplish the purpose of confrontation of administrators and teachers, the first substantive item on the agenda was a report on the results of questionnaires administered in February. A COPED staff member who had summarized the data, gave the conference feedback on the beliefs of Hancock administrators and teachers concerning needed innovations, on hopes for success as recorded in February, and on feelings about change. Following this feedback, discussion groups were formed to "explore agreements and differences   innovations needed to make the Hancock school system more self-renewing and to help each other increase participant-observer skills."

A concrete outcome of the two-day conference was the formation of eight sub-groups to meet during the remainder of the school year. These groups were to be composed of at least one member from each of the discussion groups formed at the two-day conference. On April 14, 1966, at a Junior High school building, a meeting was held to launch these groups in their on-site meetings. The charge given to the eight groups was "to undertake the examination of one (or more) of the following learning needs and to clarify and structure a plan of action to be followed during the remainder of the school year: (1) an in-depth study of process and process agents; (2) an in-depth study of recommendations from the two-day conference; (3) an in-depth study of the concept of self-renewal; and (4) an awareness of emerging needs identified by participants." By May 5 each group had designated a meeting time, and by May 17 all had met at least once. By that time it became clear that the COPED orientation toward change was "getting through" to at least some of the Hancock people. These participants, without prompting by COPED consultants, invited members of one group to attend the meetings of another to "function in the role of process observer."

The last intervention of the 1965-66 school year was an all-day meeting on June 2 involving the participants in the April 1 and 2 conference. The goals of this meeting, as outlined in a planning meeting on May 19, 1966, were: (1) to support and improve communication; (2) to provide a model of classroom action; (3) to move toward building level involvement; and (4) to arrive at a decision concerning the steps to be taken in the fall.

The first of these goals involved communication between members of the present Hancock planning committee organization and the remainder of the system as well as communication within the committee itself. In fulfillment of the second objective, a model of classroom activity was presented. The presentation was a case study of what a teacher with a "slow group" can do to change her reputation and the reputation of the class within the school. Her main problem was to reinforce maturity in an immature group and the central issue was discipline. After discussing this with the class, the problem was seen to revolve around a few disruptive students. The teacher approached the solution to the problem through the establishment of a steering committee composed of class members, a collaborative steering committee, teacher development of a list of class rules and a charge to the class to enforce these rules. By isolating the problem and involving the class in developing the solution to the problem, the teacher had directed her attention to the changing of behavior rather than to mere punishment and had thus provided a positive model of classroom action from which other teachers could benefit.

The third goal of the conference, moving toward building level involvement, was fulfilled insofar as some discussion was held regarding a "building concerns" program for the project. The fourth item among the goals resulted in a decision to form a Summer Discussion Program. This program as conceived would involve groups which were to concern themselves with five areas of discussion: (1) curriculum content areas; (2) our changing society; (3) the school as a social institution; (4) learning theories; and (5) a human relations seminar. These groups which involved about twenty-five members of the Hancock staff, met over the summer of 1966 and provided continuity for the project during an otherwise somewhat dormant period.

In addition to the summer study program, a further opportunity to provide continuity was the attendance of the superintendent and the vice president of the Hancock Teacher Association at an human relations laboratory during the early part of July.

On June 22, 1966, a planning meeting was held, attended by the Hancock steering committee as well as the COPED staff. The steering committee had grown out of a recommendation of the conference of June 2. Its membership was composed of representatives of both teacher and administrator groups. At this June planning meeting, it became clear that the major effort of the Fall activities would be to increase membership and staff participation in training activities. Also discussed at this meeting was the question of building level activities. No plan for such activities were made, however, because the steering committee people felt that they had not yet been sufficiently trained and the system was not yet ready for any implementation of committee-induced substantive change.

Another issue discussed over the summer was the role of the principals. The superintedent was especially, and not surprisingly, concerned with how to create a climate in which administrators' feelings could be expressed to him. It was suggested that one procedure for the autumn might be meetings of principals with COPED staff to explore goals and to clarify the principals' role in the project.

To open the academic year 1966-67, a major two-day planning session (August 23 and September 1) was held by the COPED staff and the steering committee. These meetings were centered in the establishment of project plans and orientation for the fall term. Although the discussions at these meetings had sufficient range to cover all of what were later to be important developments during the year, the thrust of the final consensus achieved can be labelled "Let's spread involvement."

After the experience in the spring and summer -- through both the study groups and the laboratory training for two important members of the steering committee -- there was some sense that COPED still had not found a clear direction. Part of the dilemma stemmed from the original proposal and its call for a second phase that would take "task forces" into individual buildings to promote change. None of the steering committee members felt ready to lead such a task force, neither the original teachers and administrators who had received about thirty-six hours of training, nor the summer study groups. No one was about to volunteer. In addition, there was some inclination on the COPED staff to resist being bound to the original proposal. While it was true that the first training sessions had followed the rough outline as proposed, no one in COPED wished to be limited by a document composed before a relationship was developed with the project and already nine months old. Yet, in their need for some firm direction, the members of the steering committee rallied behind the original proposal as a stabilizing element in a field of undirected "chaos."

Many suggestions were made. The Hancock people felt that the school system was under great strain from several directions and that perhaps COPED could help with this strain, to minimize it or make it creative. Various projects were mentioned including the idea of a middle school organization and a curriculum development project in vocational education scheduled to be introduced into the new vocational-technical school opening in September, 1967. The discussion revolved around certain general questions: Where should COPED focus its energies? Building units, for instance, would provide change-agents with thirty-one points of entry, while projects such as ABLE would provide many fewer. Should primary effort be aimed at the project-level, the building level, or indeed the system-level, and are these different levels mutually exclusive?

One factor that aided in a temporary settlement of these issues was the fact that beginning in the fall semester, Hancock change agents would begin to receive training in the Change Agent Seminar. It was generally agreed to postpone any direct-action program at the building level until the training of these seven people was well under way.

It was decided at these meetings that, in the meantime, efforts would be made to extend participation. Concern was expressed over the possibility of there developing an image of an honorary society. It was agreed that people must eliminate the "rites of passage barriers to membership in project activities. It is clear that the steering committee had already begun to pick up informal feedback that accurately portrayed a significant element of the project's image in the school system as a whole. Many teachers felt that the project was either an administrative tool or an offshoot of the in-group that controlled the

Hancock Teacher Association. Whether or not this view had any basis in fact or not was less important than the suspicion thus created by COPED's very existence. The considerations of this problem of image played an important part in the decision of the steering committee and the COPED staff to concentrate in the first months of 1966-67 on the task of spreading participation in COPED.

Once the decision was taken to spread COPED more widely through the system by increasing its membership, the means to accomplish this were quickly deviced. It was decided to hold an orientation session in October for each of two groups of fifty staff members. These two sessions would be followed by weekends for the same groups as soon thereafter as possible. Close attention was paid to the issue of voluntarism, and the planning group made every effort to make the invitations as voluntaristic-sounding as possible. There was also an effort to invite persons from as many different parts of the Hancock system as possible, including those taking part in various on-going projects. It was also decided that at these sessions there should be some representation of those who had participated in previous training sessions. To accomplish this, half of the principals were invited to each of the weekends.

Before these efforts to extend membership were implemented, other moves were made to inform members of the system about COPED. On August 31 the chairman of the steering committee, who was a member of the Hancock staff, spoke to the new teachers of Hancock, presenting them with an overview of the COPED project and inviting their questionsand participation. On September 13 he also spoke before the Hancock school committee.

The teachers and administrators who were involved during the first year met together on September 29, 1966. The program for this meeting included a panel on human relations training with those members of the system who had participated in summer training presiding. Included were the superintendent, the vice president of the Teachers Association, and a junior high school teacher who had spent five weeks in a training consultant program at the National Training Laboratories in Bethel, Maine. There were also reviews of summer study groups, system projects and prospective training groups for administrators. The conference sub-groups of the previous year met to decide their future courses of action and four decided to disband to join other activities. While the other groups made no decision to disband, none of them met during the school year.

The planning for the all-day sessions for prospective members to be held on October 11 and 13, took place on October 4. Only four Hancock members of the steering committee attended the planning meeting. At the meeting there was a review of the procedures used to select the fifty participants for each session during the previous year. A consideration of these procedures shed light on the previously perceived "elitist" image of the project in the system. Fifty of the participants were selected from the Teachers Association building representatives who were elected to this position. It had been noted at the planning meeting of August 23, 1966 that the position of building representative was not particularly attractive. Thus many people holding the position had been coerced into doing so. Nonetheless, they did represent an aspect of the leadership of the Teacher Association leadership and might have been viewed by some as members of an "in group". The other fifty members were selected from the original list of "status leaders, people participating in particular projects (ABLE, Individualized Instruction, etc.)." Insofar as there existed an in group in Hancock prior to COPED, it was probably composed of these people who were most active in system-wide projects. To select members from this group for training did nothing to alleviate out-group feelings of other staff members.

The programs for new Hancock people did not vary significantly from the model employed at the original meetings held the previous February. The two groups of fifty met on October 11 and 13. Work groups discussed "What changes need to be made in Hancock for it to become a self-renewing system?" and "What does a self-renewing school system mean to me? In what ways will it affect me? How do I feel about it?" The second stage of the orientation, the two "overnights" were scheduled for October 20-21 and November 4-5. The first had to be cancelled because of a lack of funds. A local foundation which had sponsored the first orientation meetings in February and April, had been asked by the Hancock schools to also fund these weekend sessions. As of October 14 no definite word had been received, however, and the Hancock steering committee was forced to cancel the October 20-21 session.

At a planning meeting on October 18, feedback from the two days of orientation meetings was discussed. Apparently there was anxiety among even highly committed members of the project that the programs were creating more stresses than they were relieving. Hancock members felt distrustful of COPED staff; they did not recognize the recommendations presented at the meeting on September 29 as being their own and believed that an entirely new list of recommendations was being imposed on them by the COPED staff. At a late October meeting held with the Hancock steering committee members and the COPED staff, this issue was discussed. It was determined by the COPED staff that the perceptions of Hancock members in regard to what was expected of the COPED staff diverged from the reality of available staff time for consultant aid to the system. It would be necessary, it was decided, to "renegotiate with the original principal-teacher group" and the best way to do this would be a survey via interviews or questionnaire. But no such survey was ever conducted.

Shortly after the October 18 planning meeting, the foundation committed funds for two weekend training sessions. These weekend session were held on November 4-5 and December 9-10. In general the weekeneds were concerned with problems of communication; the November session dealing with communication between COPED staff and school system project leaders, and the December session discussing communication within the Hancock system.

The tentative agenda was planned collaboratively by the COPED staff and the Hancock steering committee. At the session, however, a problem arose over the need to change the agenda. There was insufficient COPED staff to handle the meeting as planned, so the staff proceeded to make adjustments in the program. The Hancock people, not seeing the need for such fundamental revisions in their work, felt betrayed. The difficulty was eliminated in an evaluation session after the first day of the weekend, with both groups participating. The workshop itself concerned the nature of the change process and was designed to include presentations by COPED staff followed by small group discussions.

Also discussed was the issue of conflicting interpretations of the roles of teachers and administrators and how these different interpretations interfere in communication with others within the system. After the workshop, the Hancock members agreed that the agenda revision had been justified. and felt that the program of the weekend had been satisfactory.

The issue to be handled at the second weekend involved communication within the Hancock system. But the rather acerbic negotiations that were proceeding between the Hancock Teachers Association and the School Committee had a negative effect on the program of this weekend and on any COPED interventions aimed at increasing communications. The subject of the second weekend clearly followed closely that of the first, yet the effectiveness of the program was limited by the fact that the issue of the negotiations was continually raised in the small groups of teachers and principals that met to discuss communication problems in Hancock. Clearly the problem could not be solved at this session; nonetheless it was hoped that discussion of the issue directly would help to free participants to see the usefulness of open and honest confrontation. There is no basis on which to judge the extent to which this end was achieved. Because there was a very live issue in the system at the time, involvement in the discussion on the importance of open communication was quite extensive. At the very least, it is clear that the COPED message had a greater impact during these sessions than at the first overnight.

Building Concerns

One of the long-range developments in the intervention of COPED in Hancock has been the focus on the concerns of individual buildings in the system. Although this program did not become operational until the Spring of 1967, interest was expressed in such a program from the very beginning.

The development of the building-concern program was gradual in that from the very beginning of COPED's relationship with Hancock, there were references to the ultimate end of effecting change in individual buildings. The first mention of this objective was in the original proposal before relationship to COPED was established. The proposal contained reference to two phases of an in-service program, Phase I dealing with the training of teachers and administrators in human relations skills and Phase II dealing with the implementation of programs at the building level with "task forces" of change agents. At both the first and later training interventions, building representatives had been among the categories designated as invitees. At the summer 1966 meetings of the COPED staff with the Hancock planning committee, building level points of entry were discussed. At that time, however, no clear building-level function was conceived for the building representatives to perform.

In the fall of 1966, one of the principle concerns in planning meetings and interventions was to spread the concepts and skills associated with COPED training throughout the system. Nonetheless, as early as September, there was some planning of building projects at the two junior high schools. At that time it was clear to the COPED staff that a concrete program was necessary in order to help the Hancock people change from a level of abstract concept and skill development to a level where these skills could be utilized. In general it was not until the spring of 1967 that effective action was taken to accomplish this end. It was at the December 12, 1966 meeting of the COPED executive committee that the idea of "change units or action groups" was first formally discussed. The articulation of a "preceptorship" relationship between COPED staff and trained system members was finally achieved at the January 5, 1967 meeting of the joint planning committee. Once agreement concerning the idea of building level activity had been achieved at this meeting, the preceptors and apprentices went to work on the building level very quickly.

The first task was to construct a list of needs of the individual buildings as seen by the teachers. At a meeting on February 13, 1967, nineteen building groups and one system-wide project were described with well-formulated requests for COPED training and assistance. From these lists the chairman of the Hancock steering committee developed a list of sixteen building concerns. With the list of concerns in hand, members of the steering committee and a COPED staff member for each school worked together as apprentices and consultants, respectively.

Of the thirty Hancock schools, only seventeen participated on the building level to the extent that a topic was chosen and submitted to COPED with a request for a COPED consultant. Of these seventeen, only eleven schools conducted meetings this year. An evaluation of the results of these meetings indicate several difficulties which prevented the groups from functioning more profitably. Most obvious is the clear absence of communication between the COPED representatives and the individual schools. For example, one school has been meeting for years discussing the problem of the under-achiever, priding themselves on their initiative. The staff openly resented COPED's assumption of the responsibility for their success when the COPED representative unaccountably never appeared at their meetings. In one case, the COPED staff member was never notified on the dates of the building meetings. He attributes this to the school's apathy, but the principal had no idea that it was her responsibility to notify him personally. Based on this year's experience it will be necessary to find a new means to opening communication channels between the COPED staff and the schools involved.

As indicated in these evaluations, each school demonstrated its own stage of awareness and receptiveness to COPED goals depending on its previous awareness of COPED, the principal's ability to adopt the necessary organizational and leadership behavior, the nature of the student body, and the already existing channels for both horizontal and vertical communication. Some faculties were openly suspicious of COPED's alleged involvement with the administration, afraid of the voluntary nature of the meetings and the degree of openness required of them in front of their principal, and hesitant to assume any responsibility for their school's problems. One of the buildings, however, exemplifies an already existing sophisticated level of skill in applied group dynamics. It is necessary for the COPED representatives to become more sensitive to the existing school make-up before becoming involved in the group faculty meetings. This means that at some schools, sessions on group dynamics would be attempted before specific building concern topics were tackled. This would also help to eliminate the confusion between "process" and "content" on the part of many principals and teacher who felt that because conclusions were not made on their specific topics the meetings had been failures.

One building experience can provide a model of a successful procedure. All participants felt that they were involved, self-motivated, and had learned a good deal pertaining to their interests. Briefly, the experience included (1) a decision by the whole faculty as to the nature of the meeting they wanted; (2) plans organized by a faculty advisory council with the principal and COPED representatives present; (3) total coordination of expectations; (4) voluntariness, but with total faculty attendance; (5) a decision as to the time of dismissal participated in by all and occurring at the beginning of the meeting; (6) active participation by members of the faculty in a demonstration group on problem solving and its analysis; and (7) the development of self consciousness as to the process of group interaction and a concommitant understanding of COPED objectives. It is only after this basic understanding has been established that it becomes instructive to deal with a "content" problem, using the COPED representative to help the staff solve the problem while improving their awareness and success at group process skills.

One reason for COPED's interest in the building concerns projects was that they themselves were legitimate change projects that COPED could facilitate. Nonetheless, the primary rationale behind this program was to encourage the steering committee members to take to water rather than continue to hide behind the excuse that they were not yet sufficiently trained. It is clear that they would never have felt ready so they had to be helped to be effective with the very considerable skills which they had developed. The building concerns projects were generally unsuccessful, and the efforts of system people were, for the most part, uninspiring. Certainly, significant steps must be taken by the COPED staff and the steering committee membership to increase the effectiveness of these meetings. Nevertheless, it is of great value that a serious, even if unsuccessful, attempt is being made to realize COPED's values and objectives on a working level that involves teachers and administrators in eleven schools.

The Principals' Seminar

On the basis of a belief that school principals can benefit from administrative and organizational skill training similar to that used in industry, COPED decided to establish a skill development seminar for Hancock principals. The format of the seminar program can be perceived from analysis of the assumptions on which the sessions were based:

1. Voluntary participation would enhance learning motivation;
2. Small discussion and decision-making groups would facilitate information and perceptual exchanges and "unfreezing" of current attitudes;
3. The introduction of specific school-oriented material would benefit learning;
4. The use of an organizational theory text would facilitate learning;

5. Feedback produced by the use of summary notes on class activities would provide assistance in learning;

6. A degree of personal growth through the use of Kostick PAPI test would improve self-understanding;

7. The two-hour period after the school day, for approximately ten meetings, would be sufficient time to produce learning.

The general reaction to the seminar program was favorable, but in a very limited sense. Of the seventeen participating principals, eleven entered the seminar with the hope that they would learn specific skills in making decisions, improving their leadership techniques, giving more leadership to teachers and working more effectively with people. Many of the principals later felt that the seminar had had a positive effect on their administrative styles. Four felt that they had become more democratic in their process of decision-making; four felt that they had become more sensitized to what they were doing; three felt that they had become more aware of the needs of teachers; three felt that they had become more aware of group dynamics. Five of the participants, however, felt that they had gained nothing from the seminar.

Many of the principals attributed innovations in their schools to their participation in the seminar. Seven cited increased teacher participation in general faculty meetings, both through participation in the composition of the agendas and through broadening the range of issues to be discussed at such meetings. Six principals cited the creation of a teachers advisory group to discuss issues and provide advice to the principals. Only two principals felt that they had made no specific innovations as a result of seminar participation.

Most of the participating principals felt that an improved format for the seminar could have resulted in more learning. Only eight of the principals felt that there was a need to discuss general concepts in the first seminar meetings. All of the participants felt that the content of the discussions should have dealt more with the actual problems with which principals were working in their schools, applying the reading and lecture materials to these issues. Every participant wanted to develop specific skills with which to handle such problems.

It was the trainer's opinion that although the participants were willing and did their best to learn, the design format of the seminar did not produce as much learning or skill development as he had anticipated. In comparison with $4\frac{1}{2}$ day programs of a similar nature in industry, signs of participant skill improvement in this seminar were below expectations. The COPED staff member felt that the participants needed more grounding in conference leadership fundamentals and in the use of small group problem- and decision-making exercises. They also needed more training in appropriate actions in personal administrative and organization performance and in team problem-solving efforts. Finally, the seminar leader saw a need for research on the question of the extent to which a seminar such as this should proceed immediately into discussion of the specific problems of the individual participants. While he realized that the principals felt that more and earlier discussion of specific problems was needed, he still feels that it is better to concentrate on general skill development in the first part of the seminar program in order to prevent a weakening of participant morale as a result of premature disappointment and discouragement.

Curriculum Development

Project ABLE had been developed by a Hancock educational policy committee composed of nine members of the system. From the point of view of behavioral kinds of objectives, those nine people made all the decisions. When it came time to introduce Project ABLE to the people who would be implementing it, the superintendent brought in a learning theorist from the organization which was collaborating with Hancock on the planning of the project. The presentation to the teachers was oriented to a theoretical point of view rather than the practitioner point of view of the teacher. A member of the superintendent's office described what occurred:

> He made his presentation to all these teachers who started asking him all these nuts and bolts questions. He couldn't give satisfactory responses to these kinds of questions. He would say, "Well, we'll work that out." It was a very dismal thing, and the project really lost in the eyes of the secondary school teachers. They didn't see Project ABLE as being able to do anything for them or for the public school system.

A deeply felt need to bring to the surface and deal with the feelings of the teachers who would be using ABLE materials brought COPED and Project ABLE together. Much confusion and misunderstanding still existed in Hancock concerning this mysterious new curriculum project, and very little could be done to dispel the suspicion of teachers. It was therefore felt that a weekend program for vocational teachers, principals associated with the project, and Project ABLE staff, devoted to Project ABLE, would be most beneficial. Another factor reinforcing the decision to hold a weekend meeting was the fact that a two-week conference on Project ABLE was being planned for the summer of 1967, to be conducted by two vocational education experts from a university. The administration felt that this two-week conference should be planned collaboratively with the teachers and should involve some programming for dealing with the human relations aspects of initiating a new curriculum in a new school. It was decided, therefore, that the university personnel should attend the overnight, share with Hancock their feelings about the two-week seminar, and hopefully incorporate some of the ideas expressed at the overnight into their design for the seminar.

The overnight program was held on May 12-13, 1967. About 35 Hancock personnel, who would be associated with ABLE in 1967-68, were in attendance. The program staff was made up of both COPED staff and Hancock steering committee members. From the training point of view, the session comprised another step on the way toward developing Hancock's internal resources for human relations consultants. The program began with small groups of teachers, administrators, and university representatives all meeting separately. Later in the evening these groups reported back to the collective body. The reports from the teachers groups were direct, probing, and completely honest. They all concerned the doubts, suspicions, and ignorance that the system as a whole felt about Project ABLE. It was decided that the next day the administrative head of ABLE would address the whole group to answer issues that were answerable, that is, those that were informational in nature rather than accusations as to how theproject had been set up and was being conducted. It became evident, although previously known and constituted a primary reason for holding the conference, that despite the several pieces of literature that had been circulated in the system concerning the project, there was general ignorance and therefore suspicion of it. The presentation was well received, and in this respect the w weekend was successful in dispelling many of the unfounded rumors that had been circulating about the project. There was universal agreement within the COPED staff that this weekend was probably the most successful intervention COPED had made in the Hancock system. Genuine issues were discussed, genuine feelings were aired, and genuine satisfaction marked the reactions of most of the participants.

It was hoped by the COPED staff that the leaders of the summer seminar from the university would ask the help of COPED in planning the two-week seminar. There was an attempt by them to include one member of COPED in the planning, but when they learned that he would not be able to attend, no further efforts at cooperation were made.

The principle gap in Project ABLE planning had been the absence of internal public relations which would have better prepared the system for the eventual acceptance of a new curriculum. In a sense, the overnight program was an attempt to make up for lost time.

Hancock had learned the importance of the human relations dimension in the introduction of change in a system.

A major innovation to be considered by Hancock was participation in ES 70. This program was developed by the Division of Adult and Vocational Research of the United State Office of Education and was concerned with the formulation of a student-centered curriculum which will allow maximum flexibility in post high school activities for both vocational and academically oriented students. The goals of such a curriculum is to permit post high school activity choices to be made after graduation from high school. A student should graduate from an ES 70 program equipped with entry-level occupational skills and with the qualifications necessary for continued education.

Approximately fifteen school systems across the country are involved in the project, which began in the summer of 1967. No specific statement has been made as to the duration of the project except that the materials developed by ES 70 for national dissemination would not be expected before 1970. Hancock viewed ES 70 not as a new and additional project but rather as a new source and type of funding which would provide coordination and additional financial and personnel resources for existing projects such as ABLE. As the superintendent stated it, "ES 70 will mean more money, help and assistance to do what we're doing already and to add to it only as we please."

When the superintendent realized that Hancock was about to receive an invitation from the U.S. Office of Education to join the ES 70 project, he asked members of the COPED staff for advice on how to proceed. At a luncheon meeting with three members of the COPED staff, the assistant superintendent, the president-elect of the Teachers Association and the superintendent, it was agreed that the mistakes of the introduction of Project ABLE two years earlier must somehow be avoided. It was suggested that the system give its teachers a day off to discuss, evaluate, and make recommendations about participation in ES 70. The superintendent accepted the suggestion immediately. At the same luncheon, the Hancock members designed the entire schedule of activities for the day, without any substantial aid from COPED staff members sitting at the table. This incident was probably the most significant outcome of COPED's work in Hancock.

The calling of this teachers conference served two functions. The first was a meeting of the requirements of the recently approved teachers contract. The contract specifies that no major curriculum projects will be approved withouout the School Committee's hearing the recommendation of the Educational Development committee of the Teachers Association. As this committee did not yet exist, the teachers' comments and concerns regarding ES 70 as expressed at the conference were to be summarized by the executive committee of the Teachers Association and presented to the School Committee in lieu of a report from the Educational Development Committee. The final decision regarding participation was made by the School Committee, but the new contract guarantees that teachers will be informed and their reactions will be heard before major curriculum decisions are made. The second function was to implement the lessons in human relations learned by the administration, to show how important it was to the central administration that, whether contractual requirements existed or not, the entire staff participates in the decision-making process.

The conference began on June 14, 1967 at 9:00 a.m., following a brief meeting of the COPED staff and the selected group leaders from the Hancock faculty. At a general session, an explanation of how Hancock became involved with ES 70 and the purposes of the conference were the first activities. The faculty was then divided into 26 groups, with four roving COPED people providing assistance to group leaders. Later each group presented a question to be answered at the general session by a panel representing the superintendent's office, the Teachers Association, and Projects ABLE, SEARCH, AND PLAN. At this general session, the groups also summarized their reaction to ES 70.

The general reaction of the teachers to ES 70 was positive, although many were opposed to participation. Some felt that the question had already been decided and that participation was a foregone conclusion. Others expressed feeling that participation in ES 70 was an expression of certain individual's personal ambition and not a response to system's needs. Teachers in private comments characterized those who vocalized comments favorable to ES 70 as "bucking for principal job" and when a critical comment was made, they noted that the speaker was leaving on sabbatical. Others felt that the system had enough (or too much) going already and gains from these experiments should be consolidated before taking in another project like ES 70. (This comment elicited applause from the audience). One teacher expressed concern that a class with a cross section of students would defeat the idea of ability groupings. Others mentioned that they couldn't even obtain supplied as needed despite all the money in the system for projects. One teacher asked, "Are we changing for change's sake?" Another said, "We're taking a dive with a blindfold on. We now have kids on the college track who cannot get into college -- with ES 70 and same instruction time we're to prepare kids for both college and vocations? It's an impossibility."

It was clearly not a foregone conclusion that Hancock was to participate in ES 70. The superintendent had agreed to reject the program if the teachers disapproved it. In the view of COPED staff members, it was the realization by the teachers of the superintendent's sincerity in taking their interests and desires into account that made the difference between rejection and broad-based affirmation of the program by the faculty.

In reaction to the conference itself, at least three teachers mentioned to COPED staff the contrast they saw between this conference and the "fiasco" at the introduction of Project ABLE. They attributed the change in atmosphere to COPED. "Now there is recognition that teachers are people whose needs invlude coffee breaks, a decent lunch, and having their questions listented to." This, in combination with the reorientation of administrative attitudes and procedures, represents the difference COPED has made to the Hancock school system.

HAMILTON

The town of Hamilton is located in Southeast Massachusetts, thirty miles southwest of Boston and eighteen miles northwest of Providence, Rhode Island. It is a rather industrialized community with a considerable amount of manufacturing, particularly in the textile industry. The presence of one of the first women's colleges in the country gives the town some academic flavor.

The town has seen fairly extensive growth in population since World War II, particularly between 1945 and 1960. The State census of 1965 indicates that perhaps the growth has ended or at least tapered off. In 1960, a significant 42.3 percent of the town's population was 19 years old or younger, and the estimated median age was 25.2 years. Nonwhites comprised only 0.6 percent of the 1960 population.

Absolute and Percentage Change in the Population. 1940-1965.

Year	Population	Actual Change	Percentage Change
1940	3107		
1945	3096	-11	-0.4
1950	4401	1305	42.2
1955	5160	759	14.7
1960	6818	1658	32.1
1965	6737	-81	-1.2
1940-1965		3630	116.8

Sources: U.S. Census of Population.
Massachusetts Census of Population.

The median number of school years completed by persons 25 years old and older in 1960 was a low 10.8. Of this same group, a very small percentage, 41.8, had completed high school, while 3.7 percent had completed less than five grades. Of the employed 1960 residents, only 15.9 percent were engaged in professional, technical, managerial or proprietary occupations. Median family income was a relatively low $5900, with only 9.1 percent of families having incomes of $10,000 and over, and 11.0 percent of families having incomes under $3000. All of these data give a picture of Hamilton as a predominantly working class community, the only such community to be involved in the Boston area COPED project.

The town is governed by the classic open New England Town Meeting. As in all Massachusetts towns an elected Board of Selectmen, in this case composed of three individuals, administers the town government and implements the policies of the Town Meeting. The schools are governed by a popularly elected five-member School Committee. The school budget, like that of all Massachusetts towns, is determined by the School Committee and given rubber-stamp approval by the Town Meeting.

The property tax rates in Hamilton have fluctuated over the last five years. The per capita tax levy had increased rather significantly until 1966 when the town began to receive the benefits of additional state aid resulting from the recently enacted sales tax. In 1966, the stated tax rate on $1000 of assessed valuation was $40.00, while the actual tax rate on $1000 of full equalized valuation was $36.71. The total debt of the town, as of January 1, 1964, was $1,120,000, or $164.27 per capita.

Hamilton Taxes: Rates on $1000 of Assessed and Full Equalized Valuation, Levies Raised and Levy Per Capita (1960). 1962 - 1966.

Year	Assessed Valuation	Stated Tax Rate	Full Equalized Valuation	Actual Tax Rate[1]	Tax Levy	Tax Levy per Capita (1960)[2]
1962	$ 6,861,675.	$111.20	$19,239,400.[3]	$39.82	$766,156.	$112.37
1963	7,930,250.	98.80	22,150,000.[4]	35.52	786,789.	115.40
1964	19,857,400.	42.40	22,150,000.[4]	38.01	841,954.	123.49
1965	20,982,800.	47.60	24,000,000.[5]	41.62	998,781.	146.49
1966	22,023,975.	40.00	24,000,000.[5]	36.71	880,959.	129.21

1. Calculated by dividing the tax levy by the full equalized valuation.
2. All Per Capita 1960 data based on the U.S. Census of Population.
3. Based on 1961 State Report.
4. Based on 1963 State Report.
5. Based on 1965 State Report.

Sources: Files of the Massachusetts Taxpayers Federation.
Reports of the State Tax Commission upon the Equalization and Apportionment of State and County Taxes.

The school system of Hamilton is very small, including only two elementary schools and a high school. In addition, the town is a member of the Southeastern Regional Vocational School District. Along with the population growth in the town has come an increase in school enrollment, and overcrowded schools at the elementary level. The possibility of double sessions has been a problem that the town has had to face. The town had financed an eight-room addition to an elementary school in 1964 but felt that it could afford no further capital expenditures.

The expenditure data shown below indicate that the town has begun to rapidly increase the level of expenditures per pupil in Net Average Membership. These increased outlays are the result of significant increases in the teacher salary scale and of a lowering of the pupil-teacher ratio through as increase in the size of the staff. Both of these trends are particularly demonstrated in 1966-67 and can be attributed to the very large increase in state aid to the town. Ironically, the net cost of education to the town actually decreased in 1966-67 from the previous year. With the prospect of more state aid, Hamilton appears to have entered an era of "easier money" and perhaps of greater innovation.

Hamilton School System Data: Total Enrollment, Number of Teachers, Pupil-Teacher Ratio, Expenditures per Pupil in Net Average Membership, Minimum and Maximum Teachers' Salaries, 1962 - 1966.

Year	Total Enrollment	Number of Teachers	Pupil-Teacher Ratio	Expenditures per Pupil NAM	Teachers' Salaries Min.	Teachers' Salaries Max.
1962-3	1565	64	24.5	$397.	$4300.	$7280.
1963-4		69		438.	4600.	7616.
1964-5					4700.	7728.
1965-6				502.	5000.	8164.
1966-7	1639	87	18.8		5200.	9152.

Sources: Files of the Massachusetts Teachers Association.
Files of the Massachusetts State Department of Education.

Nonetheless, there are still financial problems facing the town. One is the aforementioned lack of sufficient physical plant. The second is the new salary situation being faced by Hamilton, and most other Massachusetts cities and towns, as a result of the passage by the state legislature of a collective bargaining law applicable to teachers and all other municipal employees. The effects of this law are likely to be a new militancy among teachers and improved working conditions as well as higher salaries. Hamilton's teachers, ironically, chose to utilize collective bargaining because they thought it was required rather than just optional under the new law. Teaching staffs in other systems in the state, including some participating in COPED, have hesitated to invoke the option of the law for fear of alienating their school committees and compromising their professional status. In Hamilton, there were no such fears and apparently no alienation or compromise. The School Committee did not disapprove of arrangements made by the Massachusetts Teachers Association for the local association to be the collective bargaining agent. This was preferable, in the eyes of both the School Committee and the teachers, to the Amercian Federation of Teachers.

With these financial problems still to be faced, there is nonetheless hope in the system that money will now be available for innovation. To date, the system has been receptive only to those innovations that have been sweeping the country and which have not been excessively expensive. Examples of innovations adopted include modern mathematics and the "PSSC physics" program. The only major innovation in recent years that has cost the system a substantial amount of money, above the normal expenses for changing curriculum, has been a language laboratory. If the low degree of innovation in the system is linked to a lack of financial resources, as appears to be the case, the easing of the financial difficulty as a result of vastly increased state aid will likely lead to a higher of innovation.

2

As with all other change agent teams in the Boston area, Hamilton's participation in COPED was negotiated by the superintendent and the COPED staff. It was then presented to the School Committee for approval. Hamilton's interest in the project was function of the superintendent's interest in the applicability of human relations training to school systems. It is not clear, however, that he or other leaders of the system were aware of any serious problems in staff relationships or communication. Hindsight has shown, however, that there were some issues that needed clarification and attention.

The members of the change agent team were selected for membership by the superintendent. His desire to achieve representation from all levels of the system led him to choose the two elementary principals, the high school assistant principal and a classroom teacher. When the assistant principal withdrew from the seminar in January, the superintendent joined the team in his place.

Like most change agent teams, the Hamilton participants found the fall overnight session to be the most favorable aspect of the change agent program. One team member indicated that his initial feeling about the superintendent's invitation to join the project had been that Hamilton needed no change. After the fall session, he came to reject this initial reaction and to feel that change was just what this system needed. But it was the consensus of the Hamilton participants that after this overnight session, the program consistently went downhill. In the seminar they felt lost, receiving no direction from the leaders or other members. They were unable identify any specific goals or measures by which to evaluate their own success or failure as change agents. As a team they met once a month, in addition to the seminar meetings, but still could find no meaningful direction in which to aim their efforts. As a result, the judgement they make as of the summer of 1967 is that there have been no significant changes in Hamilton that can be attributed to the system's participation in the COPED program.

Within the context of the change agent seminar, the Hamilton team made two efforts to seek a viable and useful project to undertake. In March the members asked the COPED research director for some feedback from the core package of tests which had been administered in the system the previous autumn. This indicated a serious effort on the part of the team to identify some problem areas in which some work was needed. The data available, however, was too general to be of any help. As one change agent stated it, "After a discouraging fall semester in the seminar, the core package was looked on as a salvation. But the data we received from it were not definitive enough to identify any particular issues."

In the meantime, one Hamilton change agent, an elementary principal, had been working on a local, non-COPED project and hoped that the change agent team might be able to provide him with some assistance. This project, called SPOKE, is to be a joint effort of Hamilton and five surrounding communities to establish an educational media center from which all can draw materials. The project was still in the writing stage at the time of the principal's request for aid, but it was his hope that the change agent team could plan a strategy to acquaint the school system and community with the project so that a munimum of resistance could be encountered when the program went into operation. This may yet become a project of the change agent team, but to date no action has been taken.

One might hypothesize that the Hamilton change agents had difficulty finding a viable strategy of intervention in their system because the system, as the administrators originally suspected, has no serious issues or concerns. On the surface, given the favorable conditions for communication in a small school system, there did appear to be relatively high morale and a fairly high degree of efficiency in the system. The process of collective bargaining, however, served to focus attention on an existing communications problem.

When the present superintendent came to Hamilton in 1962, there existed a superintendent's advisory committee composed of principals and teachers. In 1964, this committee was transferred to the auspices of the teachers association in order to elicit responses more directly from the teaching staff. The committee remained in existence until the spring of 1967, but in all the years of its existence, it had not made a single recommendation to the superintendent and had played no role in the ongoing changes taking place within the system. When negotioations between the School Committee and the teachers association began, however, issues appeared which the top administrators had not been aware of.

It is clear that this committee did not actually function as an open channel of communication between the teaching staff and the administration. Seeking an explanation of this, the superintnedent speculated that the failure of the council may have been due to the people appointed to its membership. Perhaps the principals had had undue influence in the selection procedure. He also felt that perhaps the limitation of the council's concern to system-wide issues was a factor in its ineffectiveness. He admitted, however, that even with both of these drawbacks, there should have been some way for the issues raised at negotiations to have previously arisen from within the system.

This review of the recent history of the Hamilton school system indicates that there may be issues that a COPED change agent team might attempt to tackle. The COPED change agent program clearly did not aid in the identification of such issues. One reason for this was the disappointment the change agents felt in the seminar and their consequent lack of committment to the project. A probable second factor is the lack of more direct contact with a COPED staff member who would take Hamilton as his primary responsibility and owrk with the team to critically examine the system. In the seminar, this job of critical examination was left to the change agent team itself. Perhaps an identification of the system's communication problem would have occurred prior to collective bargaining negotiations had an objective outsider participated in thorough study of the system.

FRANKLIN

The town of Franklin is a relatively large residential suburb of Boston located four miles west of the city. As is characteristic of a primarily residential town, wholesale and retail trade is the leading source of employment, but the majority of residents commute to Boston or other neighboring cities for employment.

Situated so close to a central city, Franklin experienced most of its population growth in the early part of this century. Since World War II, its population has decreased slightly. In 1960, only 24.3 percent of the town's population was 19 years old or younger, and the median age in the town was 43.1 years. Nonwhites comprised 1.0 percent of the 1960 population.

Absolute and Percentage Change in the Population. 1940-65.

Year	Population	Actual Change	Percentage Change
1940	49,786	7154	14.4
1945	56,940	649	1.1
1950	57,589	-713	-1.2
1955	56,876	-2832	-5.0
1960	54,044	-436	-0.8
1965	53,608		
1940-1965		3822	7.7

Sources: U.S. Census of Population.
Massachusetts Census of Population.

The median number of school years completed by persons 25 years old and older in 1960 was 12.6 years. Of this population group, 67.8 percent had completed high school while only 3.1 percent had completed less than five grades of school. Of the employed 1960 residents, 38.5 percent were engaged in professional, technical, managerial or proprietary occupations. Median family income in 1960 was $8380, with 40.2 percent of families having incomes of $10,000 and over, and 8.7 percent of families having incomes of less than $3000.

Of the 19,646 housing units in Franklin in 1960, 5,978 or 30.5 percent were single family dwellings. The median value of these single family homes, according to the 1960 census of owner estimates, was $27,800. Apartment living is prevalent in the town, and 6,815 buildings, or 34.7 percent of the total number of housing structures, were buildings with five or more units. The median 1960 rent in the town was $121 per month.

The town is governed by the limited Town Meeting, to which voting members are elected by the local precincts. The administrative arm of the Town Meeting is the elected five-man Board of Selectmen. The schools are governed by a popularly elected nine-member School Committee. The school budget is approved by the School Committee and then rubber-stamped by the Town Meeting, in accordance with Massachusetts tradition.

The actual property tax rates in Franklin have fluctuated over the last five years, but in general have tended to remain constant and even decrease. The tax levy per capita over the same period has also tended to fluctuate, but there has been an increase of about 15 percent. In 1966, the stated tax rate on $1000 of assessed valuation was $56.00, while the actual tax rate on $1000 of full equalized valuation was $26.30. The total debt of the town, as of January 1, 1964, was $6,559,000, or $121.36 per capita (1960).

Franklin Taxes: Rates on $1000 of Assessed and Full Equalized Valuation, Levies Raised and Levy per Capita (1960). 1962-66.

Year	Assessed Valuation	Stated Tax Rate	Full Equalized Valuation	Actual Tax Rate[1]	Tax Levy	Tax Levy per Capita (1960)[2]
1962	$216,899,900.	$48.50	$348,407,500[3]	$30.29	$10,553,197.	$195.27
1963	223,236,900.	51.00	424,000,000[4]	26.93	11,417,952.	211.27
1964	227,340,900.	56.00	424,000,000[4]	30.03	12,731,090.	235.57
1965	231,968,000.	56.50	465,000,000[5]	28.19	13,106,192.	242.51
1966	236,280,000.	56.00	465,000,000[5]	26.30	12,231,680.	226.33

1. Calculated by dividing the tax levy by the full equalized valuation.
2. All per capita 1960 data based on the U.S. Census of Population.
3. Based on 1961 State report.
4. Based on 1963 State report.
5. Based on 1965 State report.

Sources: Files of the Massachusetts Taxpayers Federation.
Reports of the State Tax Commission Upon the Equalization and Apportionment of State and County Taxes.

The school system of Franklin includes two small primary schools K-3, eight elementary schools K-8 and one comprehensive high school. Total estimated enrollment in the system as of October, 1966 was 6900, and enrollment has remained fairly constant over the past five years. The size of the professional staff has continued to increase over the same period of time, even as the enrollment has remained fairly constant, and the pupil-teacher ratio has declined as a result. Over the past five years, the expenditures per pupil in Net Average Membership has always been relatively high by metropolitan Boston standards, and the system has maintained its lead by constant increases. Similarly, the teachers' salary scale has always been one of the highest in both the metropolitan area and the state, and has increased sufficiently over the past five years for Franklin to retain this position of leadership.

Franklin School System Data: Total Enrollment, Number of Teachers, Pupil-Teacher Ratio, Expenditures per Pupil in Net Average Membership, Minimum and Maximum Teachers' Salaries. 1962-1966.

Year	Total Enrollment	Number of Teachers	Expenditures Per Pupil NAM	Pupil-Teacher Ratio	Teachers' Salaries Min.	Teachers' Salaries Max.
1962-3	6959	369	$595.	18.3	$4600.	$9000.
1963-4		384	678.		4700.	9300.
1964-5			710.		4700.	9500.
1965-6			744.		5200.	11,000.
1966-7	6900*	411*			5400.	11,718.

* Estimated.

Sources: Files of the Massachusetts Teachers Association.
Files of the Massachusetts State Department of Education.

In addition to its relatively large expenditures for education and its relatively impressive salary scale, Franklin has had a reputation among laymen for being one of the "better" school systems in the area. Whether deserved or not, this reputation at least implies that the town is interested in its educational system and in "doing things for kids". Franklin participation in COPED is a reflection of a "larger commitment" on the part of its superintendent of schools: "After two to three years on the job, I knew that in order to do what we wanted with kids, we had to do something with teachers and with the way they feel about their work." The Franklin schools, through a staff member, had already had contact with the University COPED staff and expressed enthusiasm about the potential of the COPED project. The superintendent met with the project director and was favorably impressed with the possibilities of participation in the program. In April, 1966, COPED issued an invitation to the Franklin schools to participate in the program. In May, 1966, a meeting to discuss participation was held by the COPED staff and a group representing the school system. Included in this group were the superintendent, the president of the teachers club, the assistant superintendent, an elementary school principal, the director of research and development and a member of the School Committee. In June, after receiving a letter from the project director delineating the extent of commitment involved, the Franklin schools decided to participate under Plan A (change agent team and seminar), rather than under Plan B (intensive involvement of the COPED staff in the system), as originally intended.

Following discussion of team composition, it was decided that the change agent team would be composed of representatives of the School Committee, the administration, the teaching staff, the special services staff and department chairmen. A notice was sent through the auspices of the teachers club to all teachers, including special services teachers, asking those interested in the project to apply for participation. About a dozen teachers responded, and two were chosen by the consensus of the superintendent, the director of research and development and the COPED project director. The same committee selected applicants from among administrators after a similar process of solicitation. In the selection process, emphasis was placed on an individual's indicated ability to fill the role of change agent or on an individual's apparent need of a COPED experience to "unfreeze".

Reactions on the part of Franklin participants to the change agent seminar program were mixed but generally tended to be negative. One participant who was pleased with the program felt that the seminar, and particularly the reading materials, had provided a "formal knowledge of change and how it takes place in a social institution." Another team member enjoyed the social interaction provided and the opportunity to observe COPED staff skillfully handling large meetings. All team members but one attended the fall weekend program and felt, with varying degrees of enthusiasm, that the experience there had been valuable. Finally, there was general agreement that COPED was valuable as a resource for consultant help on special projects.

A variety of negative reactions was indicated, but within this diversity ran a consistent theme of disillusionment and disappointment coupled with a feeling of exploitation. The team members felt that COPED had not accurately portrayed what a COPED experience would involve and what skills and benefits could and could not be expected from a year of participation in the project. Furthermore, team members felt that there was insufficient commitment of time to the seminar by the senior COPED staff and inadequate preparation for the seminars by COPED staff members. It was moreover felt that the COPED staff failed to handle smoothly even the mechanics of the program, including determination of meeting place and availability of assigned books. The disappointment with the COPED staff was heightened by some envy of the saturation of COPED staff in the intensive treatment systems. "Those of us not involved in the intensive COPED plan felt left out and somewhat foolish." In general, it was felt that participation in COPED had not lived up to the participants' expectations. A few severely disappointed team members realized that part of their disillusionment could be attributed to unrealistic expectations: "I guess I wanted a handbook of suggestions which I could cull from." In general, however, members felt that they had been "taken", that there was little similarity between COPED and its advance billing.

There was even some feeling of exploitation by COPED staff. While the Franklin agent team wasted its time and grew frustrated at the seminars, some team members felt that their brains were being picked for the benefit of COPED research.

There was also a feeling in Franklin that COPED had not clearly informed the system of the nature of its commitment until after commitment had been made. This was offered as an explanation for Franklin's switch from Plan B to Plan A. It was also part of the reason given for the system's refusal to participate in the data collection aspect of the program. The superintendent had placed responsibility for the data collection aspect of the program in the hands of the director of research and development. He met with the COPED research director and agreed upon a program for Franklin involving one hour from pupils and teachers and two hours of administrative time on each of six specified days. Upon receiving the core package of tests, the director of research and development decided to discull the COPED data collection plan with the superintendent. Their joint reaction was negative and their decision was to refuse to participate in the testing program. Their major objection was the core package itself: a "fish net" which was felt would not measure the impact of COPED's limited intervention in such a large system. A second objection, described by them as "minor" was the disruptiveness of a six-date testing program and the resulting potential for the creation of morale problems within the system. (The fact that the COPED testing p rogram, of the several testing packages to be given in the Franklin system that year, was the one that was eliminated is probably indicative of the relative priority of the COPED project in the system's hierarchy of concerns.) A final objection to the testing program concerned COPED's handling of the data collection scheme insofar as the extent of the program had not been spelled out for the system at the time of commitment. "We were hit with it when we were already hooked. We don't think this was intentional, but it was the way it happened."

During the period of Franklin's participation in the COPED change agent seminar, the system held a full-day institute on the subject, "Can Teachers Be Agents of Change?". The idea of holding an institute cannot be attributed to the influence of COPED on the system. There had been an institute the previous year also, in that instance lasting for half a day, concerned with the METCO program of bussing Negro children from Boston to schools in Franklin. Nonetheless, the particular topic of this institute has been attributed at least in part to a relationship with COPED. The superintendent felt that participation in COPED was also a reflection of his previous concern in this area.

The topic for the institute was suggested by the superintendent to the teachers club. The club discussed alternative topics as well, but "The bandwagon was change," and the superintendent's suggestion was accepted. A committee was established by the club to work on the planning of the institute. The institute was not a project of the Franklin change agent team, although team members were involved as individuals and COPED staff persons were used extensively as consultants to the planning committee. "The institute idea was originally independent of COPED, but later COPED was intimately involved in the design of the conference and provided valuable assistance. Mainly COPED gave us support for the idea, incentive to work on it and encouragement that it would work." During the institute, the teachers met in 45 groups of ten each. The reactions of each group were presented by group spokesmen to the faculty as a whole and to a responding panel composed of two University professors (one of which was a COPED staff member), one Franklin department head and one teacher (also from Franklin), both of the latter being members of the system's change agent team.

As a result of the institute, the teachers created a faculty senate, to be composed of an elected representatives, one from each of the system's schools. The role of the senate is to be that of a lobby for the teachers with the administration. In less specific terms, the institute seemed to have a significant impact on the Franklin teachers. "The institute provided ventilation for the system." "The emotional impact of the whole thing on teachers was very good; teachers felt they had a chance to say something."

There were no programs originated or implemented within the Franklin system as a result of the system's participation in the COPED program. The change agent members indicated that they had expected to implement change in the system. "I anticipated that each group in the change agent seminar would be expected to do something specific." The team was looking for suggestions, guidelines, or at least an offer of help that would serve as a signal to begin action. "We were grasping for straws; the March 17 all day conference was finally seized upon so we could say we had done something."

If COPED were to be re-funded by the Office of Education, it is still uncertain that Franklin would continue its affiliation with the program. One change agent team member has asked to be released from the program; another appears likely to withdraw; another does not care one way or the other; only two are enthusiastic and wish to continue with COPED. The superintendent, the sixth member of the team and the real decision-maker in this matter, seems reluctant to spend more of his time with the change agent seminar if it continues in the same vein. Furthermore, he sees indications of a continuation of the seminar format since he feels that the evaluation meeting produced no substantive changes in the COPED design. He is reluctant to send others to participate if he is not sure it will be more worthwhile than it was in the past.

If there is continued participation, team members feel that there will have to be some revisions in approach. The team found it difficult to operate as a team since they met together only at the seminar itself. Effective participation would require regular allocation of school time for scheduled team meetings. It is also felt that the composition of the team would have to be altered from the present "top heavy" emphasis. Four of the team members represented the "powers" in the system, while only two represented the teaching staff. A possible alternative structure for future participation would be to turn the program over to the newly created faculty senate and thereby involve more teachers. Even given such internal revisions, continued participation is by no means assured.

The impact of COPED on the Franklin system is difficult to assess. The system is fairly large, and the extent of intervention was very limited. The superintendent's leadership style and interest in change are responsible for the system's participation in COPED. Moreover, his interest in communication with all levels of the system and his knowledge of the necessity of teacher willingness as a prerequisite for change in the system indicate that his influence and that of COPED cannot be separated. All that can be said is that the relationship of the system and COPED has _perhaps_ given focus and impetus to the forces within the system which were leading in the direction of greater communication between administrators and teachers, greater flexibility regarding innovations and a larger role for teachers in the decision-making process of the system.

JEFFERSON

The town of Jefferson is a generally middle to upper middle class suburb of Boston, located about eleven miles northwest of the city. It is primarily a bedroom community for commuters to Boston and neighboring communities, but is also the home of several electronics and clean manufacturing firms located on Route 128, the Electronics Belt, that passes through the town.

Since World War II, the town has experienced a tremendous increase in population, particularly in the 1950's and early 1960's. While the rate of increase has tapered off in the past few years, the town's population is still increasing and as of 1965 had reached 31,388. In 1960, 39 percent of the town's population was under 20 years old, and the median age in the town was 32.6 years. Nonwhites comprised 0.5 percent of the 1960 population.

Absolute and Percentage Growth of the Population. 1940-1965.

Year	Population	Actual Growth	Percentage Growth
1940	13,187		
1945	14,452	1,265	9.6%
1950	17,335	2,883	19.9%
1955	22,256	4,921	28.4%
1960	27,691	5,435	24.4%
1965	31,388	3,697	13.4%
1940-65		18,201	138.0%

Sources: U.S. Census of Population.
Massachusetts Census of Population.

The median number of school years completed by persons 25 years old and older in 1960 was 12.6 years. Of this same group, 70.4 percent had completed high school and 3.4 percent had completed less than five grades of school. Of the employed 1960 residents, a high percent, 43.2, were engaged in professional, technical, managerial or proprietary occupations. Median family income in 1960 was a correspondingly high $9043, with 42.1 percent of families having incomes of $10,000 and over and 5.5 percent of families having incomes of under $3000.

Of the 7182 housing units in Jefferson in 1960, 6980 or 97.2 percent were single family dwellings. The median value of these single family homes, according to the 1960 census of owner estimates, was $19,800, and the median monthly rent in 1960 for the few apartments and flats that existed was $109.

The town is governed by a representative Town Meeting with each of six precincts being represented by 33 elected Town Meeting Members. The administrative branch of the government is the elected five-member Board of Selectmen. The schools are governed by an elected five-member School Committee. As is the case with all Massachusetts towns, this committee is for all intents and purposes the final arbiter of the school operating budget but must seek actual as well as official approval of the Town Meeting for any capital expenditures.

The actual property tax rates in Jefferson are comparable to those of most communities in the metropolitan area and have been increasing in spurts. The tax levy per capita has also been increasing, but at a steadier and more rapid. In 1966 the tax rate levied on $1000 of assessed valuation was $43.60, with the variation from the rate on $1000 of full equalized valuation being only a few cents. The total debt of the town, as of January 1, 1964, was $11,493,000, or a relatively high $415.04 per capita (1960).

Property Taxes: Rates on $1000 of Assessed and Full Equalized Valuation, Levies Raised and Levy Per Capita (1960). 1962 - 1966.

Year	Assessed Valuation	Stated Tax Rate	Full Equalized Valuation	Actual Tax Rate[1]	Tax Levy	Tax Levy Per Capita (1960)[2]
1962	$163,764,415	$39.80	$163,764,415	$39.80	$6,531,824	$235.88
1963	169,279,100	38.80	181,250,000[3]	36.32	6,583,443	237.75
1964	172,929,100	38.60	181,250,000[3]	36.83	6,675,063	241.06
1965	179,091,350	44.00	184,500,000[4]	42.71	7,880,019	284.57
1966	184,293,300	43.60	184,500,000[4]	43.55	8,035,188	290.17

1. Calculated by dividing the tax levy by the full equalized valuation.
2. All per capita 1960 data are based on the U.S. Csnsus of Population.
3. Based on the 1963 State Report.
4. Based on the 1965 State Report.

Sources: Files of the Massachusetts Taxpayers Federation.
Reports of the State Tax Commission Upon the Equalization and Apportionment of State and County Taxes.

The school system of Jefferson as of 1966 consisted of ten elementary schools grades 1-6, two junior high schools grades 7-8, and a town-wide senior high school. The fall of 1967 saw the opening of the eleventh elementary school and the extension of the school program to include Kindergarten. With the town's tremendous growth in population has come a proportionally larger growth of school enrollment.

The COPED-Revere School relationship was originally based on the existing teacher training relationship between the school and a college. Most of the early COPED-Revere phase involved COPED staff from the college only. The college faculty members who were supervising student teachers at the Revere School were aware of the fact that the principal was interested in change and discussed COPED with him.

On May 20, 1966, the COPED project director met with the Revere School principal and the assistant superintendent for elementary education. The trio discussed the School's possible participation in COPED. On June 6,1966, the assistant superintendent informed the COPED project director that he had prepared a tentative program and budget for Revere's participation in COPED. This tentative program and budget had been discussed with the superintendent of schools, who was will to have Revere become associated with COPED. On June 20, 1966, COPED was presented as "new business" to the Jefferson School Committee, and Revere School participation was approved with a Budget of $7,060 for 1966-88.

In late June, 1966, a meeting was held at the college with the COPED staff and the Revere School principal to discuss and plan the school's participation in the project. At the end of the 1965-66 school year, the COPED project was "presented and explained to the Revere School faculty. Their participation was invited and the invitation was accepted." Despite this simple positive statement about that meeting in COPED records, much controversy surrounds the introduction of COPED to the faculty. Some of the teachers who were present at the time don't even recall any such presentation. Others remember COPED being mentioned, but say they did not get a clear idea of what COPED was. Others remember the meeting and say that although they didn't know what COPED was, they voted to accept it, basing their decision on their faith in the principal and his desire to have COPED in Revere.

During the summer, one member of the Revere change agent team selected by the principal attended a human relations training program in preparation for her role with COPED. When the Revere School reopened in the fall of 1966, approximately one half of the faculty was new. Although new teachers were to have been told of the Revere School - COPED commitment in their job interviews, several had not been informed. Both the new teachers and the teachers who had been at Revere the previous year say they were "sandbagged" early in the school year with the information that last year's faculty had committed the school to COPED, thereby obligating the teachers to give up four weekends for COPED. Evidently, there was little additional information given on COPED, and no effort was made to convince the faculty that COPED was valuable and worth sacrifices on their part. The change agent who had attended a training program during the summer inadvertently furthered the animosity and confusion regarding COPED, as she was in her own words "terribly gung-ho" about COPED and training, but unable to coherently verbalize the experience. As a result, anxiety was increased over this vague, mysterious "rebirth" process associated with COPED.

One of the new teachers spearheaded the resistance to COPED, even to the point of carrying her indignation over "being forced" to participate in COPED to the assistant superintendent for elementary schools. During the early fall at

Revere, both new and old teachers were hearing conflicting reports about how great COPED would be (from the change agents), how they had to fulfill the commitment (which had been made by the previous year's faculty) to participate in COPED and how Jefferson had no right to commit teachers' weekends without their being consulted. The most active opposition to COPED was on the part of a vocal minority. However, all of the faculty felt pressured and upset by the issue. The change agents were enthusiastic and tried to enlist support from their friends and fellow teachers. The principal was strongly supporting COPED, and some teachers did not want to oppose anything he wanted because of their personal respect for him, and because of their concern about the teacher evaluations he would write. The COPED opponents were reflecting and reinforcing an increased militancy and independence felt by many members of the faculty.

During this early period of fermenting dissent, no contact was made with the Revere faculty as a whole by the COPED staff. As the opposition and confusion about COPED continued, a meeting was held, on October 3, with the COPED staff and the Revere faculty to "reassess the commitment to the project". At this meeting opposition was express, questions remained unanswered, and nothing was resolved. Most objections concerned the weekends (Thursday and Friday nights and all day Saturday) which were to be devoted to COPED. This seemed to some an excessive amount of time "above and beyond professional call of duty" to be taken both from professional planning and preparation time and from personal obligations and recreation time. More important, the objections were symptoms of resentment that the project was being forced upon them by the administration without their advice and consent. At this point, possible benefits had not been adequately explored and clarified. The COPED representative at this meeting agreed that it would be contrary to COPED philosophy to hold the faculty to such a commitment if they weren't sincerely interested in the project. He recommended that the opposition select several representatives to attend the planning meeting for the first weekend session.

The COPED suggestion was accepted, and opposing elements were represented at the planning meeting held three days later. Total attendance at that meeting included five teachers, the principal, the superintendent of schools and his assistant for elementary education, four members of the COPED staff and the COPED project director. This meeting appears to have been quite successful. After the opposition presented its case and COPED staff presented their goals, feasible alternatives to the weekend as planned were discussed. The teachers felt the meeting was helpful and suggested that a similar meeting should be held with the entire faculty.

On the afternoon of October 17, the requested meeting was held, with the entire faculty, the principal, the assistant superintendent, the college COPED staff, and the COPED project director in attendance. At this meeting, the entire faculty had an opportunity to question participation in COPED. Again, most objections concerned the projected weekends, and the objectors were predominantly "the young marrieds" of the faculty who were reluctant to give up time with their families. A vote was taken and those opposed to the weekend were in a minority, but the polarization in the faculty was clear. The weekend plan was nonetheless dropped, as the COPED staff felt that while the opposition as only a vocal minority, it did represent very strong feelings and had created a deep split in the faculty.

In order to re-establish good will and to prevent widening of the COPED - caused schism in the faculty, the weekend plan was altered. Under the revised schedule, COPED activities would be conducted on Thursday from 1:30 P.M. to 9:30 P.M. (Thursday afternoons are set aside for special help throughout the system) and on Friday from 4:30 P.M. to 9:30 P.M.

At the general faculty meeting, it was also decided to appoint a planning committee composed of Revere faculty representatives and COPED staff to meet before each COPED program. This planning committee was an outgrowth of the ad hoc committee which had formed earlier when the opposition's teachers sent representatives to the first planning meeting. At the first meeting of the planning committee, it was decided that "1) Revere and COPED staffs should jointly influence general objectives and general design questions for a particular meeting; and 2) specific design questions would be determined by the COPED staff." It is not clear as to what extent this involved the teachers in the COPED decision-making process, since it is difficult to know how much policy was actually determined in the settling of specific design questions.

With agreement reached as to weekend programs and with the establishment of the joint planning committee, the Revere faculty explicitly re-accepted participation in COPED at the October 17th meeting, six weeks after the opening of school. It appears that most of the controversy could have been avoided if the returning Revere faculty had heard a persuasive and enlightening presentation of COPED from the COPED staff before they heard about all the sacrifices they would be obliged to make for some mystical program that couldn't be explained. In order for COPED to have taken the initiative at the beginning of the school year and present a coherent description of the program, better communication and cooperation would have been required within the COPED staff, especially between portions of the COPED staff from each of the two colleges involved. A meeting was held later in October at which the problem of "improving COPED team communication and collaboration" was discussed.

An additional exacerbating factor in the controversy was the issue of implicit coercion and pressure teachers to participate. This was particularly clear because the system had shown a willingness to pay for the activity and the building principal had made it known that he wanted all his staff involved. It seems certain that COPED would have been more readily accepted by the Revere teachers if they had felt that there was some choice about participation.

Most of the opposition to COPED in Revere seems to have been to the way things were handled rather than to the COPED activities per se. Perhaps COPED should have originally considered possible alternatives to the weekend plan for such young and often newly married faculty members. Certainly closer communication between COPED and the school and within COPED would have led to awareness that the 1966-67 Revere faculty was not a continuation of the 1965-66 faculty, but a new group, one half of which had not participated in any decision. The 1965-66 Revere teachers who left included most of the school's leadership and COPED supporters. The teachers who were new to Revere in the Fall of 1966 were coming into a new system, for some, into a new region of the country, and for a few, into their first teaching assignments. Revere represented for them an undefined situation, reinforced by the announced move of the principal in the middle of the year to prepare for the opening of a new school. COPED became another undefined element in the general situation.

Perhaps much of the general frustration in the school was focused on COPED, with the project being used as a scapegoat. Despite all the problems that perhaps could have been avoided, it is possible that the anger and confusion over COPED at Revere in the early fall aided COPED and COPED goals by getting everyone involved, either for or against COPED, and making ovbious the need to resolve the resulting schism in the staff. "Maybe all the early dissention helped us get together later." Some teachers, however, feel that the relatively high degree of present unity of the staff is no greater than the unity that existed before "the COPED crisis".

After the re-acceptance of COPED, a series of meetings were held with activities designed to increase the teachers' interpersonal sensitivity and awareness of group processes. At the first meetings, the teachers were introduced to force field analysis, group observation, set reduction activity and practice in giving and receiving help. The most successful activity, according to the Revere teachers, was the force field analysis, and several of them have employed it in their work. The other activities were beneficial to some teachers and considered a waste of time by others. One repeated criticiam was that there were many activities with little if any connections between them. "They said they didn't have a bag of tricks, but that's how it seemed." In general, however, the response to the first COPED meetings was favorable.

The December COPED meeting was conducted by the COPED project director. The purpose of the meeting was to evaluate the core package of research instruments and its implementation at Revere School. Teachers generally objected to its length and to the fact that they were asked to make evaluations about the rest of the faculty at a time when all teachers did not know each other. Again, the majority of the objections were to the manner in which the testing was handled rather than to the substance of the program. Teachers objected to COPED's expectation that children could freely answer questions about their teachers when the teachers were in the room. One teacher reported a class in which the questions were not generally understood by the class, and one student dictated answers to others. While the reaction to the core package and its implementation was thus generally negative, the response to the December meeting was very favorable. Similarly, the general attitude toward the project at this time was quite positive.

After the second December meeting, three task groups were established in Revere School. One group did nothing. The second group chose to discuss interpersonal relations among teachers and between the teachers and the principal. The group quickly retreated, however, into the threatening area of curriculum matters. Meetings were held on both and social science curricula, and subject specialists met with the group. The majority of the group later decided that their uneasiness had allowed them to be sidetracked from their real interest in interpersonal relations, and that they would return to this subject and leave curriculum discussion to the third group. The third group was more specifically concerned with curriculum, and under its auspices, Revere teachers visited another school to observe classes in reading and social studies.

In January, another two days of meetings were held, and these proved to be a turning point in the COPED - Revere relationship. Problem solving skills and force field analysis were again the substance of the sessions. Near the end of the second day, when future plans were geing discussed, the major resistor "blurted out" that the teachers felt they wanted to participate in COPED on a meeting-to-meeting basis to see if they liked it. The COPED project director then vehemently stated that sporadic, ad hoc meetings, which were to be individually evaluated, were antithetical to COPED goals. COPED was not a program to do something *for* them, to meet their approval, but *with* them to meet their needs. Further, Revere participated or it didn't; there was no middle ground. The blunt confrontation on the issue seemed to be what was needed to arrive at agreement on future plans. These plans included: 1) Human Relations for those who wanted it, and 2) Task groups on topics of the participants' choice. Teachers were free to participate in one, both, or neither of the activities. This was the first time the voluntary aspect of COPED participation was emphasized. The teachers eagerly discussed COPED for more than an hour beyond the scheduled end of the conference, and the meeting signaled the end of the "difficult" phase of Revere School. Though all problems were by no means solved, the effectiveness of the project increased from this time onward. Nonetheless, it was not until mid-January that the former Revere principal and the COPED project director reconciled their views of the project. The principal had not realized until then that the project direction was determined by consensus -- COPED was not retreating under pressure from the teachers.

Two task force groups and the Human Relations Training group were formed, and meetings were scheduled. Only two or three teacher did not participate in any activity. The Human Relations Training group fluctuated around 15 members in size and the two task forces involved 16 teachers. The issues raised in the Human Relation training included male-female attitudes and inter-generational differences. For almost all who participated this was reported as a positive experience. While there was a bit of disruption caused by the presence of a slightly different group of teachers at each meeting, it was nonetheless generally felt that this was the most successful aspect of the COPED program at Revere.

One task force concerned itself with student discipline problems. This group, which included the new principal, developed a set of guidelines for Revere School. The other task force grew out of a human relations training session and was concerned with "equal rights for Revere School". This area of concern reflected the feeling of many on the faculty that Revere did not receive a fair share of supplies and teacher aides and was an "orphan" in the system. The task forces understood they were to receive assistance from the Coped college staff person who was the student teacher supervisor for the school. There were some hurt feelings over what the teachers felt was a complete lack of interest on the part of the Lesley faculty in their task force activities. This feeling persisted in spite of a memo sent from Coped to Revere task group members encouraging the groups to meet on their own, to carry our plans they may develop and to call on Coped staff for consultant help as needed.

At the beginning of February the transition from one principal to another took place very smoothly. The new principal had been participating in Coped activities, including the Human Relation Training, with the teachers and this eased the transition. When eight teachers were scheduled to transfer with their former principal the following year to a new building, the staff did not become polarized between those leaving and those staying. (Approximately 2/3 of the faculty had requested the transfer and approximately 1/2 of the regular faculty had received it.)

All of those transferring were young teachers. Of the few older teachers, two or three had expressed an interest in going to the new school and were encouraged by the principal to request a transfer. They did not do so, however, The principal felt that they did not really think they were wanted. Since they did want to move to the new school and since the principal insisted that they really were wanted, there still appears to be a problem of communication at Revere, especially in the area of intergenerational differences. With relatively young teachers coming to Revere in 1967, it appears that this problem might persist. If so, it could be the basis for continued COPED intervention in the school.

The persistence of the generational problem not with standing, the Coped experience has had an effect on the Revere School. Specific activities which developed from COPED include the task groups, the new school rules and a student advisory council, composed on one girl and one boy from each room in grades 4 to 6, which meet regularly with the principal. Some efforts have not been so successful. Great disappointment resulted from a teachers meeting at which the teachers planned to have the faculty divide into small groups and use force field analysis to deal with the "equal rights for Revere" issue and then meet together to discuss the small group results. When the faculty meeting was held, this concern was one of eighteen agenda items, and the new principal came to the meeting with a list of complaints all prepared. Despite this, the teachers meetings are reported to be freer since the advent of COPED. The staff atmosphere is better and more communication is taking place among teachers and between principal and teachers.

Possibly the most exciting Coped result is the number of teachers who are using understanding and techniques developed in Coped meetings in their classrooms with their children. Example of this include a teacher who now regularly brings a latecomer entering the classroom up to date with what is going on in the class. Other teachers are encouraging more group activities and have developed seating patterns with desks in clusters and the more conducive to group participation. Several teachers mentioned an increase in their sensitivity as a teacher. A greater awareness of the individual child,of the child's feelings. "The inside and outside group game made me realize how my kids feel being put on the spot".

One teacher had a discussion with her class on the topic of fear of speaking before the class. Another teacher divided her class for fifteen minutes into groups of four or five, later meeting together and writing down all the problems that concerned them. This list then became a source of topics for the class to discuss.the last ten minutes of the day. Another teacher had a discipline problem with four big boys in her class. She met with the boys and asked their help with the problem. The boys supplied the solution, suggesting that they sit in the four corners of the room, as far from each other as possible. Coped's introduction to the technique of force field analysis let to another teacher asking her class "Was this a plus or minus day?" and "Why?".

A teacher of first grade had her class sit in a circle and discuss "How do you feel about the sun, moon, school, me?" Her class felt free enough to tell her what they didn't like with 24 of the 26 students actively participating. This same class, after viewing a film about a live gingerbread man, discussed what it would be like to have a gingerbread man in the class. Would he be laughed at because he looked idfferent? This let into a class discussion on the experience of having one Negro child in the class. The class of "slow" first graders carried on an animated discussion of "differentness" for 45 minutes.

As the 1966-67 school year came to an end, it was generally agreed by the teachers that participation in COPED had been beneficial for themselves and for Revere School. In the early part of the year, COPED signified only frustration and chaos, but by the end of the year it had begun to imply progress. Criticism was still being heard and confusion still existed over the objectives of the program and the means to achieve these objectives. But there was generally agreement within the staff that sufficient benefit had been received from the program to have made all the earlier tension and confusion worthwhile.

REFLECTIONS ON A PROJECT IN SELF-RENEWAL IN TWO SCHOOL SYSTEMS

NYC COPED STAFF*

In separate reports, we have described the strategy of planned change which we used in this project (Miles and Lake), our concept of self-renewal and case studies of the two school systems with which we worked (COPED IN BUCKLEY, and COPED IN OLD CITY). The purpose of this paper is to present our conclusions from these experiences. This is done in terms of the major issues we encountered.

I. Flexibility of Intervention Strategy

Primarily because of our research interest and our contractual commitment, we entered the two school systems with a strategy of change which was largely predetermined. It specified the target groups with which we would work, the sequence in which we would work with these groups, the calendar time at which interventions would be held, the length of some interventions, the variables of the system's operation which were to be changed, and the technology or methodology to be used in effecting change. While the superintendent and other key system members were made aware of these 'givens before work was undertaken (Miles and Lake), this specificity of initial strategy seems to have had the following impact upon the project:

A. It made it difficult for the COPED staff to respond to on-going events. For example, the Ontario meetings in Old City, which were initially planned independently of COPED, resulted in the identification of a series of problems and recommendations which, if not acted upon, would confirm people's suspicions that this project, like others in their memory, would come to naught. But once these were formulated, administration of the core instrument package as a means of identifying system problems, and limiting problem-identification and solving to the top group, both of which were required by the strategy, appeared to those involved in Ontario as stalling. On the other hand, had we not administered the core instruments, we would have had to give up commitments which we had made both to the sponsor and to other regional teams of COPED.

B. It increased the difficulty of working collaboratively with the clients. The major issue to be decided by the clients was whether to "join up" with COPED, since so many of the other important questions in planned change (Buchanan, 1967) were specified by the strategy. Thereafter, the COPED staff members were more in the role of interpreters of the strategy, and protectors of it, than they were collaborators with the client in solving problems. This seemed to have had two effects upon the client personnel*: it reinforced the expectations of some that COPED methods were more interested in "getting thesis material" than they were in helping Old City or Buckley, and it limited the extent to which system personnel could feel 'ownership' in the project. It also influenced the COPED staff in three ways: it placed us in conflict between obligation to the system to 'flex' vs. to the contract and other COPED regions to "hold the line'; between our commitment to collaboration with the client versus our commitment to research; and it led to disagreements among the COPED staff in that members had different degrees of commitment to (or different interpretations of) the initial strategy.

---

* Prepared by Paul Buchanan on basis of analysis of the project by the whole staff.

In Old City, the tendency was for the COPED staff to provide the rationale for the next step called for in the strategy, then if the clients were not convinced of the desirability of implementing it (or when there were conditions of more immediate concern to the clients), COPED accepted the deviation and tried to implement it. This seems to have reduced the effectiveness of the staff in helping carry out the (deviant) action. ("How can you be effective if your heart is not in it?") It also probably communicated to some of the system personnel that seemed to communicate that the COPED staff were no more effective than they were in coping with the controlling forces of the system.

C. We are left with two questions: How can research regarding the effectiveness of a specific strategy of planned change be undertaken, and, what is involved in collaboration?

1. Regarding the research question, one possibility is for the researchers to specify only the variables which would be the focus of change effort and several alternative paths for changing them, leaving the determination of which action alternative is to be used to evolve through interaction and collaboration with the client. Thus the researcher could find out how change in one variable -- however brought about -- affected specified other variables. This approach is likely to to yield important and valid information regarding causal relations among significant variables of system operation; but it is not likely to yield information regarding the relative effectiveness of a particular strategy of change.

A second possibility is to formulate some general principles of a strategy in advance, establish a tentative relation with a client system, observe the operation of the school in sufficient detail to determine the relevancy of the proposed change strategy to the current conditions and the needs of the system (including such things as the (formal and informal) power structure of the system, the relation between the school and the political forces in the community, etc.), and then modify the strategy to more nearly fit the situation. Then specific steps for implementing the general strategy could be developed in collaboration with the client and in response to events as they unfold. The staff could also formulate and test short-range hypotheses regarding the outcomes of interventions (as done by Benedict, Calder, et al, 1967). While this approach seems appropriate as a way of testing a general strategy, it falls short as a means of assessing the relative (i.e., comparative) usefulness of a specific strategy of change -- since the accommodations which are likely to be made in adapting it to the specific situation are likely to be great (as happened in the present study).

---

*These effects were much more pronounced in Old City than in Buckley.

A third possibility is to develop a detailed strategy as was done in this case, then terminate contact with the client if deviation from basic aspects of the strategy becomes necessary early in the project. This approach may not be as arbitrary as it seems: if the strategy saying that team-building with the top group is essential is valid as a strategy, then once that step is taken (i.e., once team-building is accomplished in the top group), the logic of the next steps is likely to be apparent to the top group and collaboration on implementation becomes possible. (See Blake's work as an illustration -- Blake and Mouton, 1964). Furthermore, as Argyris has suggested (1961), for other members of the client system to see that the consultants can influence their bosses -- or at least can avoid being caught in the "illness of the situation" -- gives them confidence in the project and in the competence of the consultants. And if the consultants indicate willingness to 'stand by their guns' even at the price of terminating the relationship, this is likely to convince the client that they know what they are doing and thereby lead the client to agree to the condition.

To be able to take the third approach -- i.e., terminate contact with the client if the initial deviation is too great -- the change agents/researchers would have to have alternate school systems with which they could work, a condition which may be difficult to meet.

2. The question about collaboration arose both between the client and the consultant groups, and within each. Some of the issues which gave rise to conflict between the consultants and clients (especially in Old City) were mentioned above. In part, they originated in the differences in the "cognitive maps" of the two groups -- as discussed in the next section. In part, they originated in different weight given to tradition versus theory as criteria for actions.

Interaction (again, especially in Old City) between consultants and clients appeared not to develop liking, trust, and identification to the point that these served as a basis of influence and to the point that they increased the recognition of common interests -- superodinate goals -- which were inherent in the situation. (In Buckley, there appeared to be more trust, liking, and identification between the two groups.) Finally, it seems likely that strain among the consultants who worked with Old City contributed to tensions between them and the clients.

Stresses among the consultants may also have communicated to some of the client personnel that the COPED staff members were uncertain about what they were doing or that they lacked expertise.

Stress among the consultants arose from differences in commitment to initial strategy, from differences in the perceived consequences of modifying the original strategy and therefore in willingness to deviate from it, and from differences in the personal styles of the consultants. This strain was identified and discussed at COPED staff meetings, and changes were made in staff responsibilities which reduced the stress. But by the time these problems in staff relations were worked through, major decisions with the client had been made, and the client's preceptions of the consultants, the client's interpretation of deviation from the initial strategy, etc., were already formed. Furthermore, meetings where work on consultant-client relations and expectations had the best chance of being accomplished were the very ones for which the client saw little need.

As mentioned above, one of the issues of disagreement among staff was the consequence of proposed deviation from the original strategy. Upon further reflection we think the issue can be formulated as follows. If the goal is G, and the consultant is offered the options of terminating contact or working toward G-minus-N (i.e., by a deviation from G), the issue is whether G-N is likely to get the system closer to G (in which case it is a viable alternative) or whether G-N is likely to become a substitute for G (in which case it is not a viable alternative). Still another option might be to accept the deviation but call attention to the likelihood that it might become a substitute for G, then set up means for determining whether this occurs and take corrective action if it does.

II. Cognitive Mapping

The superintedent of Buckley had participated in an NTL summer laboratory while the superintendent in Old City had not (as had no one else from Old City). This meant that the Buckley superintendent was more in agreement with the COPED staff regarding concepts in terms of which current problems of operation in the school could most fruitfully be diagnosed, regarding what team development involves, and regarding the potential payoff (i.e., the change goals) from the project. This difference appeared to account importantly for the fact that Buckley's top group spent 7 days in off-site meetings (team building meetings) while Old City's spent two, and why the outcome of the two meetings were different. The two superintendents were operating from different "cognitive maps."

Some information and experience regarding systematic problem-solving, team-building, and process analysis was provided participants at the Zenith House conference. This experience, in which Old City's superintendent became quite involved, was an important factor in his becoming interested in COPED. But it was clearly not sufficient for him to anticipate (and be prepared to endure) the costs of team-development (the strong feelings usually expressed, the conflict and confrontations required), or understand the unavoidability of incurring such costs if fully effective teamwork were to be attained, or to have the image of potentiality which such development can lead to. Instead, the superintendent of Old City considered it inappropriate for central office to try to influence a school principal by other than friendly persuasion. He also considered it highly unlikely that people's behavior could be changed. Thus when principals objected to attending the off-site meeting for purposes of team-development, he made little effort to convince them it would be desirable. His view of appropriate action was to initiate activities and structures which would enable teachers to exert more influence and become involved in problem-solving, without trying to change relations between central office and principals. In contrast, the superintendent of Buckley insisted that meetings of his key groups be held -- and they were. As one of the COPED staff noted, "There were many doubts and hesitations in Buckley, but the superintendent's forward commitment to working things through, gained at Bethel, meant that he stuck with the process. In deciding to go ahead with the (top group's) meeting, he said, "We can't not go through with it -- even if (Old City) and the others are out." While such action by Buckley's superintendent raised many problems, it did succeed in bringing about several confrontations and they contributed to rather substantial changes.

In Old City, the feelings, both negative and positive, among the top group and between them and principals, just did not become crystallized and communicated directly; no meaningful confrontation occurred. Thus the program had little impact upon the superintendent's beliefs regarding effective ways of operating and of moving toward self-renewal -- no new cognitive map was glimpsed more than fleetingly. Thus he coped with his initial dissatisfactions with staff, and with the beginnings of open expression of staff concerns at two off-site meetings in his "old" manner. And the kinds of changes reported in the case study (COPED IN OLD CITY) reveal establishment of some new procedures and structures but not much change in beliefs.

While the COPED staff which worked with Old City put about as much emphasis on the presentation of "maps" as the one working with Buckley, there seemed to be less comprehension of it in Old City; the events and feelings in terms of which theories and models become "maps" for action were just not experienced. Then, instead of serving as guides to action, the inputs by the COPED staff had little meaning to most and were a source of irritation ("more gobbledegook") to many.

This discussion suggests that the superintendent should have participated in a training laboratory (or similar experience), or that he agree to having an extended team-development session, as a necessary condition for beginning a project.

Interestingly, one of the "crucial issues" identified by one of us in our earlier work on change strategies was this point -- that the change agent needs to introduce a new model or "cognitive map" both as a basis for setting change goals and for diagnosing the system's problems (Buchanan).

III. Involvement of Lower-Level Participants

In both Buckley and Old City, teachers were involved in interventions much earlier in the project than they would have had the original strategy been followed. Why?

In both cases, the reasons were largely co-incidental to COPED: these interventions were in-service projects which included COPED-kinds of activities and theories. But in both systems the press to involve lower levels early may have also come from the idea of "collegial authority" -- the feeling that teacher expertise/interest should not, or could not safely, be bypassed. Furthermore, there were differences among the COPED staff on this issue, one member believing it quite appropriate to work with teachers early in the project.

What were the consequences of early involvement of teachers? In Buckley, the off-site intervention involving teachers apparently added to, crystallized and dramatized teacher dissatisfaction with administrators and led to effective action -- the criticism was too strong to be ignored. In Old City, the three-day meeting of teachers and administrators which was the first intervention brought about considerable change from skepticism and apathy toward optimism and enthusiasm (Watson and Lake). Later, when the expectations generated by this meeting were not met, attitudes returned more to cynicism and criticism but did not materialize in a "revolution". (A union, which was being discussed in the spring of 1966 when the intervention was held, was formed and began functioning in the fall of 1966, but with small membership and with a cooperative rather than a threatening stance.) Why no "revolution"?

Our impressions are that it was partly because actions were taken on some of the recommendations formulated during the off-site meeting, partly because plans for following-up on others were announced, and partly because the staff of Old City were almost with out exception "locals" -- born, educated, and employed in Old City.

The question of early involvement of lower-level participants came up in both Buckley and Old City in an additional way -- membership on a "steering" or planning group. In both systems, the client opted to have all role groups represented in the steering group, although this was not part of the original COPED strategy. This action seemed to have stemmed from the value system of schools which gives weight to collegial authority. From the standpoint of the COPED staff, including all roles on a steering group meant coming down on one horn of a dilemma of having a steering group "with poor data" (i.e., consisting of the top group only*) or one "with little power" (i.e., the cross-role group). The initial strategy provided a way of dissolving the dilemma: retain the power by having the top group provide the steering, and improve the data by (a) increasing the top group's receptivity to new data and new interpretations of events through the team-development sessions, and (b) utilizing information obtained systematically via the core instruments administered at the beginning of the project. However, it seemed clear that members of the system did not agree with this model as being optimal -- perhaps another example of difference in cognitive maps.

---

* We have repeatedly been impressed with the extent to which higher level administrators are "out of touch" with the views, concerns, and the performance of people at lower levels.

IV. Volunteers, or Intact Family Groups?

In almost any family work group" which is considering planned change, there are some members who do not approve of the idea and do not wish to participate. This poses a very important dilemma. For the superior to require people to attend is to begin the program with coercion as a basis of influence (which is likely to be contrary to the values of the change agent and probably of the superior) and is to create dynamics which mobilize forces opposed to the kind of learning desired. Yet the absence of members limits what can be accomplished.

In both Old City and Buckley, attendance was required at the off-site meetings of the top groups. In Old City, this coercion was compromised by reducing the length of the meeting and by postponing it, while in Buckley, there appeared to be no compromise. In Buckley, this created no durable problem. In Old City, the fact of the compromise plus the reduced length of the meeting (and probably a less effective design) meant that the hostilities which were generated in several members did not become clearly crystallized, and did not get resolved. One of the schools in Buckley held a two-day off-site meeting on a volunteer basis; while it was considered a success, it tended to polarize the faculty along "radical-conservative" lines -- "die-hards didn't attend."

This analysis seems to suggest that if the strategy being used calls for work in intact groups, then it is best to begin with required attendance and with a meeting of adequate length to work through the feelings which required attendance is likely to generate. (See Marrow, Bowers, and Seashore; and Blake and Mouton for examples.)

V. Magnitude and Distribution of Client and Staff Effort

The time devoted to the project by members of the two school systems was approximately as follows:

By key administrators	Buckley	Old City
In off-the-job interventions		
As "cabinet"	7½ days	2 days
As part of "administrative council"	8 "	1½ "
In workshop involving other sytem personnel	0 "	5 "
In planning (through Steering Committee)	8 "	4 "
In orienting other system personnel to COPED	1 "	1½ "
By principals and directors/coordinators		
In off-the-job interventions	3 "	5 "
By teachers		
In off-the-job interventions	1 "	½ "
In orientation to COPED	1½ "	½ "
In data-collection	½ "	⅛ "

In addition, in Old City, 3 principals and three teachers who were members of the Advisory Committee were in 1½ additional days of off-site interventions and spent about 2½ days in planning, while 25 teachers participated in a three-day workshop and around 3 more in task force work, and about 25 took part in two-day workshops. In Buckley, all the teachers from one school participated in a two-day workshop and in three one-hour follow-up meetings, all teachers were in 2-3 two-hour problem-solving sessions within their buildings, and the Board held a 1½ day off-site meeting.

The time investment by members of the two systems was distributed as follows:

	Buckley	Old City
First extended contact between COPED staff and system leaders	Dec., 1965	Dec., 1965
First major intervention	Feb., 1966	Mar.-Apr., 1966
First work with "cabinet"	Apr., 1966	Feb., 1966
Off-site intervention with "cabinet"	Apr., 1966	Oct., 1966
Major off-site intervention with steering committee	Aug., 1966	Oct., 1966
Work with building-leader teams	(not done)	Feb., & Apr., 1967
Work began in buildings	May, 1967	May, 1967

The above information indicates that the amount of time invested by key people in COPED interventions was smaller in Old City than in Buckley. This difference takes on additional significance when one considers that there were 7 principals and other administrative personnel in the buildings in Buckley compared to about 60 in Old City. Thus both a larger proportion of key people were involved in interventions in Buckley, and more time was spent by those who were involved.

The above information also indicates that the time spent was distributed over a rather long calendar time period.

Since both the small amount of time invested and the dispersion of effort could have been expected to result in reduced impact, why did this occur, especially in Old City?

One factor having a bearing was the availability of COPED staff time for concentrated planning and interventions. Total time allocated to the project by NYC COPED staff was the equivalent of one full-time senior member distributed among three persons, two full-time junior members (university professors who entered the project as interns and then became team members), plus one junior member who spent full time on the project, and the equivalent of one full-time graduate assistant -- or a total of four full-time professional staff.

The project required the following types of effort from staff members:

1. Development of the project plan (including a research design, evaluation instruments, ways of classifying school systems, and formulating a concept of self-renewal) at the National level, and formation and maintenance of the National organization;
2. Development of the project plan, documentation of events, preparation of reports, and maintenance of the staff team at the regional level;
3. Planning with the clients; and
4. Actual interventions.

Staff time during the 16 months from the first contact with school systems until the termination of interventions was distributed among these four types of activities roughly as follows:

Categories	Senior Staff	Junior Staff	Research Assistants
1. National COPED	24%	6%	46%
2. Regional COPED	48%	63%	46%
3. Planning with clients	12%	21%	2%
4. Interventions	15%	10%	6%

Due in part to the nature of the project and in part to the initial plan, work with school systems began before research plans and instruments were fully developed, so staff time for work with the schools was not available for concentrated work. Furthermore, the time the staff spent in contact with the clients (categories 3 and 4) amounted to an equivalent of about half the time of one person. Given the size of the school units, it appears that system personnel time investment could have been limited by the lack of availability of COPED staff. It also appears that a relatively small portion of the COPED staff's time was spent in working with clients, and that the amount of time available was much too small for the magnitude of the undertaking (size of school systems, kinds of changes being attempted, and the complexity of the research required to accomplish the objectives).

However, it is to be noted that Buckley and Old City differ considerably in the amount and in the distribution of time spent by members of the systems. Our discussion in Section II above (page 4) may account for this difference: key people in Old City were much less aware of the need for a major time investment and for concentrated effort than were key people in Buckley. Then, the disagreement between the cabinet and the COPED staff in Old City regarding the appropriateness of beginning work simultaneously in all buildings and without preparatory work with the principals resulted in a postponement of activities for about three months -- and a snow-storm plus inflexibility of schedules in March led to a further postponement of another one and one-half months.

It is perhaps worth noting that pressures of work flow, Board concern, legal responsibilities, etc., did not constitute unsurmountable barriers to work on COPED. Nor were lack of funds a barrier. We encountered nothing in the school setting which seemed to preclude the kind of developmental effort which was undertaken in this project. Rather, the difficulty seemed to lie in the "state of the art" -- in lack of the very type of information to which the project was designed to contribute.

VI. Effectiveness of the Strategy

Deviations from the strategy of change which we intended to apply and test were too numerous for dependable conclusions to be drawn from this study regarding the effectiveness of the strategy. (Furthermore, we have not yet analyzed the quantitative data which were compiled.) Yet, the experience does provide a basis for some impressions regarding problems of planned change.

The strategy was more nearly followed in one of our two systems (Buckley) than in the other. Why?

Some reasons have already been given above: the first superintendent in Buckley had attended an NTL workshop and was thus familiar with the basic processes of the strategy; no one from Old City had had experience with the strategy. Also, the philosophy of the Buckley superintendent was such that he was more willing to require relevant people to participate. But there appears to be another reason. Our strategy called for initial work with the Cabinet, or the top administrative group in each system. More specifically, it called for our helping the top group to enhance its own problem-solving capabilities so that this group could then manage the spread of change to other functional units in the system. The rationale for making the Cabinet the focal group was for us to have a leverage point for change by our linking with the central power groups in the system. In defining the central power group. we looked at the formal organization structure. But were these the people who really exerted influence in each of the two systems? Indications are that in Old City the pattern of actual influence was very complicated and did not follow the formal structure. Almost all of the professional staff except the superintendent had spent their whole professional life in the system and had grown up in the city. Thus the opportunity for informal liaison was there. For example, one of the aspiring candidates for the superintendency upon the retirement of the incumbent had been a classmate and life-long friend of the Board chairman. At the time the project began, there was a rumor to the effect that one of the members of the Cabinet, in conjunction with a Board member, was "out to get the superintendent". And another key member in the formal structure was also reported to have strong support in the community. There had also recently been a shift in the power in the city government and changes in the composition of the Board were expected, and the superintendent had reason to believe that the new Board would not support him. Thus it seems possible that the less-demanding actions taken by the superintendent in Old City may have reflected his awareness of the limitations of his power.

But this raises other interesting questions. How can a consultant determine what the actual structure of power is in a system? One way would be for him to encourage the participants to analyze and identify patterns of influence during an off-site meeting of the key administrative group, consolidating their perceptions once openess was established to the point where such issues can be confronted. Another is for the consultant to "live with the organization for a period of time in order to note influence patterns, But then when he finds the degree of such actual power does not conform to the formal structure he faces the question of how to interest powerful people in working for change. In this case, it is quite likely that the key people in the formal structure will be motivated to engage in change actions which are likely to solve problems and maintain or increase their actual power -- as long as they see sufficient probability that given steps in the change plan will successfully accomplish this. Those who hold power in the informal but not in the formal structure, on the other hand, may have little motivation to change things -- for fear of losing the power they hold, or of interfering with their own plans for change.

As noted previously, the initial strategy was more nearly carried out in Buckley than in Old City. Was there more positive change attributable to COPED in Buckley than in Old City? It seems that there was. For one thing, the change of superintendents seems to have been an improvement, and COPED appeared to be a factor both in the decision by the original superintendent to leave (by focusing and getting into the open the strength of feelings toward his ways of managing) and in formulating the criteria used by the Board in selecting a new one. There was also more evidence of improvement in the problem-solving effectiveness of the top team in Buckley. Then, while new structures were established and continued to function in both systems at the time COPED interventions terminated, the key group in Buckley showed considerably more enthusiasm about continuing self-renewal work than did the comparable group in Old City. Finally, it is logical to assume that the key people in Buckley increased their problem-solving skills and modified their "cognitive maps" to a greater extent that did comparable people in Old City simply because they were involved about twice as long with the COPED staff in off-site development sessions.

REFERENCES

Benedict, B., Calder, P., Callahan, D., Hornstein, H., and Miles, M.B. "The Clinical-Experimental Approach to Assessing Organizational Change Efforts", Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 3, No. 3 (July-Aug-Sept., 1967), pp. 347-380.

Buchanan, Paul C., Crucial Issues in Organizational Development, in Watson, Goodwin (ed.) Change in School Systems, Washington: National Training Laboratories, 1967.

Argyris, Chris, "Explorations in Client-Consulting Relationships," Human Organization, Vol. 20, No. 3 (Fall, 1961), pp. 121-133.

Miles, Matthew B. and Lake, Dale G., "Self-Renewal in School Systems: A Strategy for Planned Change," in Watson, Goodwin (ed.) Concepts for Social Change. Washington: National Training Laboratories, 1967.

Blake, Robert and Mouton, Jane, Managerial Grid. Houston: Gulf Publishing Company, 1964.

Watson, Goodwin, and Lake, Dale G., "Self Renewal: Some Concepts and an Example," (Paper read at the 44th Annual Meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, March 22, 1967).

Marrow, A., Bower, D., and Seashore, S., Participative Management. New York: Wiley, 1967.

COPED IN OLD CITY: INTERVENTIONS, DILEMMAS AND CHANGE IN A SCHOOL SYSTEM

by

Paul C. Buchanan and Robert E. Chesnoff

COPED IN "OLD CITY

The objectives of COPED* were to develop, apply, assess and draw generalizations regarding the effectiveness of specific strategies of planned change; to contribute to an understanding of problems and processes of planned change in school systems; and to help a few school systems become more effective and self-renewing." The purpose of this paper is to report the experiences of a team from the New York staff of COPED in attempting to attain these objectives in collaboration with one large school system. Attention will be given to the activities or steps called for in the strategy of change initially developed by the New York staff, to modifications which were made in these steps, to circumstances which led to such modifications, to "short-range", "clinical" information regarding the impact of the project upon the school system, and to generalizations derived from the experience. Analysis of the pre-post measurements has not been completed at the time of the writing and will be forthcoming at a later date.

I. Background

In brief, the strategy (see Miles and Lake, 1967) which was formulated by the NYC COPED staff during the early phases of the project began with initial focus on the central administrative unit of the school -- the superintendent and his central staff (hereafter referred to as the "Cabinet"). With a self-study approach, utilizing information obtained from systematic examination of current processes of work and from questionnaires, the intent was to free the cabinet for more open, collaborative, systematic problem-solving, and to deepen the members' motivation to provide leadership in a systematic change program in the whole system. To the degree that the cabinet accomplished genuine change in its own climate and problem-solving effectiveness we expected it, with help from the COPED staff, to devise appropriate working structures and to plan and conduct team-development and problem-solving activities with units both above (e.g., the Board, community organization etc.) and below it in the system. We expressed these units, in turn, to develop structures, climate, and problem-solving capabilities. These activities would contribute to a program of self-renewal that would result in improved effectiveness of the school system -- i.e., in better education of students.

A team consisting of a program director, resource staff members, and graduate assisstants undertook primary responsibility for COPED work with Old City. As part of their work they prepared detailed notes about their plans, actions, and impressions of what happened after each contact with Old City. Observers (usually graduate students) recorded happenings at several of the major interventions. In addition, Old City designated a person from the system to serve as historian. These sources provide the bases for the "clinical evaluation used in this report.

---

*Cooperative Project in Educational Development

Old City which has a population of about 115,000 is one of the many communities in the Eastern United States which are struggling to keep their public schools functioning in the face of rapid social and economic change. Ten years ago Old City was characterized in a national magazine as "a medium-sized metropolis that was slowly dying." That article served as a catalyst to efforts by government and business leaders to reverse the trend. A "Greater (Old City) Council" was formed and it spearheaded development of a master plan. This master plan included the creation of a ligh industrial park, and construction of new public buildings and an apartment complex in some of the worst slum areas. The city government was changed from a commission system to "a strong mayor-city council government and a Citizens Action Council." A non-profit corporation was formed later to run anti-poverty programs. The School Board, in conjunction with the local state college, the anti-poverty corporation, and other agencies established a massive pre-kindergarten program, a special reading program, special teacher training programs, a day and evening adult education program, a "school for dropouts", an Outward Bound program, a skills training center, and a demonstration school.

Despite these actions, a report prepared as an application for a "demonstration city" grant during the spring of 1967 indicated that many educational needs were stil unmet. For example, the report states, "Reading levels for adults applying at (Old City's) manpower center rest on the average at the fourth or fifth grade level..., the academic and vocational training now offered...is in many ways traditional rather than attuned always to the needs and capabilities of the inner-city student, it has been increasingly difficult to recruit quality teachers...(teachers) begin to doubt both the inner-city child's ability to learn and their own capability to teach them. They are burdened with large classes, clerical and sub-clerical tasks, and suffer from shortage of materials and lack of specialist aids, there is no comprehensive plan coordinating and structuring the various programs now operating in the City, and seven of the schools...show enrollments of 90 to 99% non-white."

Old City's public school system consists of 15 K-through Grade 6 schools, 3 K-through-grade-schools, 2 grade-7-through 9 schools, and one large high school of over 3,300 pupils. It has a professional staff of about 900, and an administrative staff of about 80. The student population, currently about 18,000, is declining in number as families move into the suburbs and as students shift to private and parochial schools in the city (enrollment currently around 12,000). With very few exceptions staff are life-long residents of the area.

Why was Old City interested in COPED? As the above information indicates, the superintendent was aware of Old City's problems, was attempting a number of innovations for coping with them, and saw promise in the COPED approach as indicated by his experience in the one-day meeting held in December, 1965. (See below.)

Why was COPED interested in Old City? It represented one of the kinds of cities in which we wished to apply our strategy, a metropolis, with an "inner-city", yet with a sufficiently positive outlook that improvement was not hopeless, with a superintendent and some key staff members who were sufficiently "on top of their jobs' that they could devote the time the project would require of them, on the basis of our work with them at the December meeting the staff appeared to be people with whom we could collaborate.

This report will be structured around the major steps called for in the initial strategy so that the modifications which were made as the project developed, the events which led to the modifications, and the short-range consequences of each step can be highlighted. As an aid to the reader in understanding the chronology of events in Old City, the following is provided:

1965: Dec. - Invitational conference with 19 other systems at Zenith House
1966: Feb. - Beginning work between COPED staff and the Old City Cabinet
Mar. - Ontario meetings
Apr.-May - Task Force meetings
Jun. - Formation and 1st meeting of Advisory Committee
Sep. - Two-day meeting of Cabinet
Oct. - Two-day meeting of Advisory Committee
Nov. - First administration of Core instruments.
1967: Jan. - Orientation sessions with all professional staff
Feb. - First two-day workshop for building leaders
Mar. - Second two-day workshop for building leaders
Apr. - Building meetings began
May - Advisory Committee reviewed building-level work
Jun. - Second administration of core instruments
Jul. - Four of the Old City staff attended NTL
Oct. - Advisory Committee began follow-up on work being done by building teams.

II. Interventions Involving the Key Administrative Group

The strategy initially formulated called for the COPED staff to establish collaborative relations with the superintendent and a key administrative group (or Cabinet) in from two to four systems and for each cabinet to become the initial focus of team-development. And the group having responsibility for managing the whole process in their system.

As a first step in implementing this, superintendents from 20 school systems were invited to come, with from two to four key staff members, to a one-day conference which was held in December, 1965 at Zenith House where the concept of COPED would be described and demonstrated. In addition to being of some immediate value to the participants, it was expected that this meeting would provide the school system teams a basis for knowing whether they were interested in becoming part of COPED. It would also provide the COPED staff information relevant to their deciding which systems seemed best to meet their criteria for long-term collaboration. The superintendent, an assistant superintendent, two project leaders, and the school psychologist from Old City participated in this conference. Both the COPED staff and the Old City group later decided they were interested in collaboration, and steps were taken to work out the plans and commitments which this involved.

One of the major interventions called for in the COPED strategy was a one-week meeting of the Cabinet of each participating school system during the summer of 1966 for the purposes of developing each Cabinet into an effective team and for formulating plans for the ensuing year. The superintendent of Old City was amenable to the idea of having a central group which would provide leadership to the project but at that time he did not have a cabinet. When facing a problem he tended to talk individually with one of his assistant superintendents and the business manager, then got the reaction of the other assistant superintendent before making a decision. Initial work by the superintendent and the COPED staff resulted in the discovery that the three persons wanted to work with the superintendent as a group, so a "Cabinet" to provide direction to COPED was formed.

Difficulties arose regarding the proposed summer conference. At the meeting in February 1965 of representatives from the five systems which were considering joining COPED, the superintendent of Old City stated that he could not commit the time of others from his staff who should attend without discussing it with them, and that many of his staff had already made summer plans. This issue was left unresolved, although the Cabinet and the COPED staff began work on other aspects of the project (see next section) during the spring of 1966. Then in June, in a meeting of about 15 people whom the superintendent thought should be invited to participate, the COPED staff presented reasons for holding the summer meeting and what they expected would be accomplished. Several of the key people made it clear that they saw little value in such a meeting and said that their plans for the summer prevented their attending. The superintendent proposed that attendance be made voluntary, that those interested who could fit attendance into their summer plans should do so, and that the proposed meeting of the key administrative group be held in the fall. About half the group volunteered to attend the summer meeting. However, this plan also failed to materialize. Upon learning that one of the other school systems was withdrawing from COPED (the superintendent and assistant superintendent had left the district), the superintendent at Old City, in consultation with a member of the COPED staff, decided that the Old City would not take part in the August meeting. When the issue was raised again in the fall, there was difficulty in determining who constituted a "key decision-making group" and thus who should participate in the off-job meeting. Finally, the superintendent and a member of COPED decided that this should include only the Cabinet, and that a two-and-a-half day meeting would be sufficient. This group, with two of the COPED staff, met from Sunday evening through Tuesday noon in late September.

The outcomes from this meeting which were called for by the strategy were as follows:

1. Development of the participants into an effective problem-solving team, through
    --- each person becoming more cognizant of the intentions, the perceptions, and the values of each other;
    --- enhancing norms supportive of openness, mutual influence, and confrontation of conflict; and
    --- new ideas and skills regarding ways they might make decision.

2. Formulation of plans for carrying-out actions on the Ontario task force recommendations. (See below for a description of the Ontario program.)

3. Development of long-range plans for self-renewal in the school system.

The actual outcomes, as indicated by subsequent events, were as follows:

1. The Cabinet became the central unit in planning subsequent COPED activities, and it met periodically throughout 1966-67.

2. An Advisory Committee which met the previous June was reconstituted to provide representation of each level of principals and teachers (i.e., elementary, junior high, and high school); it was given the responsibility to promote effective communication to the role group members represented; to advise the superintendent regarding work with COPED; and to take over responsibility for work on the task force recommendations.

3. The Cabinet decided it should meet regularly to exchange information of mutual interest, and to explore ways of making better use of members' time. One meeting was held for this purpose, in May 1967, in conjunction with two members of the Board. In preparation for the meeting with the Board, the business manager met with his key assistants and three principals to identify any problems the principals had with the business office. The Cabinet-Board meeting resulted in the establishment of a new position in the business office, in a decision to find larger office space for the business office, and in a change in procedures for hiring staff for the business office.

4. During the September off-job meeting of the Cabinet, several issues requiring long-range attention were itemized. However, thus far no action has been taken regarding them.

5. There was little noticeable change in the problem-solving practices of members of the Cabinet attributable to the off-site meeting -- there was little shift toward collaborative problem-solving, the superintendent continued to seek out the opinions of members one at a time before making a decision, and there was little increase of trust among members.

6. Some procedural actions were taken regarding the Ontario task force reports. (See next sestion.)

The Ontario Meetings

In March, 1966 as part of a Title I project, Old City planned to hold an in-service training meeting for approximately 50 teachers and all administrators. In light of their enthusiasm for what they knew about COPED, those responsible asked the COPED staff to help conduct the in-service meetings, utilizing some of the ideas and methods demonstrated at the COPED meeting at

Zenith House. The meetings were held at a conference site called Ontario.

These in-service meetings meant deviation from the COPED strategy for two reasons. The first reason was that conducting them meant undertaking work with people from all levels of the organization before team-building was begun at a top level. Secondly, these meetings would constitute an intervention before the initial bench-mark COPED-wide "core instrument package was administered. After discussing the question among themselves the COPED staff decided to help conduct the meeting, believing that the gains of doing so would outweigh the losees: the in-service sessions were already scheduled at the time. we were asked to help them and would be held whether we participated or not, and we thought this would be a meaningful way to convey the idea of COPED effectively and for us to become acquainted with a large cross-section of the staff, a condition which would contribute to the receptivity and understanding with which staff would respond to the questionnaires when they were administered.

The COPED staff met with the participants in Old City before the Ontario meeting and collected data using two pencil-and-paper instruments and buzz groups. From these sources it became clear that generally, the Old City educators were not optimistic about the possible results of "another meeting" and "more talk and no action." When queried about possible barriers to productive outcomes of the projected meetings, they identified a reluctance to being frank and pessimism that anything concrete would come from the meetings.

From thirty-four problems listed in one of the questionnaire the participants indicated the most important to be, "Poor public image of our school system in the community," and "Lack of parent interest in school's work." Buzz-group responses indicated that, for many, "faculty meetings," "inadequate building facilities," and "apprehension and mistrust" were seen as serious difficulties.

Two three-day residential meetings were held at Ontario. Participants included 21 teachers, 25 principals, and 26 central office administrators, directors and special services personnel, and a guest from the State Department of Education.

During these meetings the participants studied the pre-Ontario data which the COPED staff members had prepared for feedback, and diagnosed the system for the identification of most pressing problems. From a long list, several problems were isolated for further study via a systematic problem-solving sequence which was introduced by the COPED staff members, who played a relatively active role in determining methods of work, but not with respect to the content of the problem-solving. The COPED staff consistently left it to the members of the system to "do the work". (Buchanan, 1967)

These meetings proved to be very effective in creating understanding of the "COPED approach" to self-improvement, in obtaining collaboration among all levels of the organization, in developing enthusiasm for change, in identifying issues requiring attention, and in illustrating a systematic plan of problem-solving (Watson, 1967; Watson and Lake, 1967).

Within two weeks after Ontario, a COPED staff member and the Cabinet formed participants into five task forces to continue work on the major issues and to formulate specific recommendations for action. The topics for the five task forces were:

1. Improving communication and clarifying roles;
2. Relations of special service groups;
3. Teacher morale;
4. Developing understanding of the inner-city child*;
5. Public image of the schools.

COPED personnel served on the task forces primarily as observers or as consultants but were much less active than the COPED staff had been during the Ontario meetings.

Each task group met at least four times. Then an assembly of all Ontario participants was held during an afternoon early in June, at which time each task force presented both an oral and written report of its findings and recommendations.

Several of the recommendations were carried out. Before the assembly adjourned, the superintendent announced that he accepted a task force's recommendation that an advisory or steering group be formed to facilitate communication. He stated its tentative membership, and asked that it meet the following week to help implement other task force recommendations. On the basis of information developed and the action proposed by another of the task forces, the superintendent later obtained Board approval to establish a new position of Director of Pupil Special Services to provide coordination and leadership to the service groups. Members of several service groups (nurses, psychologists, social workers, etc.) worked out descriptions of their jobs, then met with members of other groups to resolve overlaps between and disagreements about their responsibilites -- actions about which people concerned were very enthusiastic. Some of the task force reports influenced planning which was done by existing committees, particularly the one on curriculum and in-serve training. Yet, as will be seen below, responsibility for implementing the task force reports was shifted around considerably and they became an important factor in the COPED project -- in both positive and negative ways.

III. Interventions Involving the Advisory Committee

As mentioned above, the superintendent accepted the task force recommendations that an advisory committee be formed and immediately appointed members to it, and asked it to meet to help him consider how to implement other recommendations of the task forces. In view of the nearness of the end of the school year, the committee suggested that work be done on the task force reports at the summer conference. Since that meeting was not held, the Cabinet put action on the task force reports on the agenda of its September meeting.

---

*It is interesting to note thant in the pre-Ontario data-gathering, the nature of the pupil population was not identified as a pressing problem.

An advisory or steering committee was not anticipated in the initial strategy (although several COPED staff had worked with other school systems which utilized such committees). One of the staff working on the Old City project felt rather strongly that having the committee was dysfunctional to the strategy in that as an advisory or planning group it would becloud the functioning of the Cabinet, and as a communication link it would becloud the function of administrators who were not members -- especially principals. However, the others felt that this committee could augment rather than impede the work of the cabinet and the principals, and that since it was recommended by a task force and the superintendent had committed himself to the idea before the COPED staff was in a position to talk it over, the decision was to not make an issue about it. (In later meetings of the Committee, a COPED staff member did call attention to the potential distractions the committee might produce, and some actions were considered for reducing this likelihood.)

As had been noted, COPED strategy called for team development and planning by the Cabinet, to be followed by team development and systematic problem-solving by successively lower (and higher) organizational units. In view of the fact that the Advisory Committee had been established, and since it then had responsibility to follow through on the task force reports, the Cabinet and COPED staff arranged for the Advisory Committee to hold an off-site meeting for team development and to work out action on the task force recommendations. But disagreement arose between the COPED staff and the Committee members concerning the length of this conference and regarding whether the primary focus of the conference should be on what to do about task force recommendations which had not yet been acted upon or upon team-development. Thus, while COPED evaluated the outcome in terms of the same criteria used in assessing the Cabinet meeting (which see above), the members were more concerned about having a plan of action. The actual outcomes appear to have been the following:

1. Little was accomplished regarding team effectiveness. Members arrived late for the opening meeting and for the opening session on the second day; they decided to end the meeting a half day earlier than planned (so it turned out to last from 10:00 one morning until 12:30 p.m. the following day); and while many "hidden agenda were revealed, they were not confronted. The only decisions made resulted from a proposal outlined by the superintendent, the rest of the group contributing mainly by helping work out details for implementing it. As one member said during the meeting, the only time the group was able to work was when they were operating in their old familiar way -- "all sat back and waited until the superintendent presented an idea", then later many criticized him for dominating the meeting. There was some "process analysis" -- discussion of how the meeting was conducted and how members viewed it -- but the

main thing this revealed was members' discomfort in doing process analysis, and thus the meeting seemed to strengthen resistance to any further team-development meeting.

2. The task force recommendations were discussed, but no steps were planned to implement them. However, much concern was displayed about "lack of action" regarding the task force reports, and about maintaining the involvement of the many teachers who took part in Ontario and/or the task force work.

3. The committee worked out a long-range plan for system self-renewal, consisting of the following:

    a. Each building (and department in the high school) would become a focal unit in self-renewal.
    b. The task force recommendations would be dropped as such, leaving to the staff of each building the decision as to what issues they wanted to work on. (This carried the assumption that if the issues identified by the task forces were important, the building staffs would say so.)
    c. Problem-solving activity, using the Ontario approach as a model, would be undertaken in all buildings simultaneously. The faculty of each building would be asked to select one or more representatives -- about one per 20 teachers -- to work with the building administrators as a leadership team. An orientation meeting of all professional staff would be held as soon as possible to get this under way, and each building would be asked to report on its progress in January. COPED staff would try to provide consultation help to buildings which requested it.
    d. The Advisory Committee would serve as a source of information and recommendation to the Cabinet, with the Cabinet being the decision-making unit.

The COPED staff members who took part in this meeting strongly disagreed with the plans which were worked out. We felt it was a mistake to begin at the building level without doing more to increase team effectiveness at higher levels (e.g., the Cabinet, and the Advisory Committee, and the Cabinet and principals). We argued that if the building teams identified basic problems, some of the problems would require changes in the relations among principals, some would require changes in the relations between principals and central office staff, and some would require changes in structures and procedures which only the Cabinet could do anything about. Unless relationships, problem-solving skills, and practices of Cabinet members and principals were effective, work at the building level would likely either not be more than "going through motions" or would lead to frustration and disappointment. (Note that our initial strategy called for such team-building at successively lower levels -- and that the Advisory Committee proposal was an important deviation from the initial COPED strategy). We also argued that activity at the building level should be undertaken on a pilot basis in order that the COPED staff could provide the required help and so that what was learned from the experiences in one building could be used by others. We also strongly recommended that, if the plan being considered were undertaken, a training session be held with principals before building level work begun.

In view of the objections of the COPED staff to this plan worked out by the Committee, a special meeting of the Advisory Committee and the COPED staff was held later to reconsider the question. However, the major plan was maintained -- almost all members thought activity had to be undertaken in all buildings in order to avoid criticism by the faculty. It was agreed, however, that a two-day training workshop would be held for the leadership teams of each building (the administrators and the teacher representatives) before building activity was undertaken. The committee also decided to familiarize the principals with the plan before holding orientation meetings with the faculty.

The Advisory Committee met periodically throughout the winter and spring, and during the fall of 1967 to exchange information regarding progress, to suggest actions for consideration by the Cabinet, and to obtain information about progress to convey to the professional staff. (As one means of keeping the total staff informed, a summary of each Advisory Committee meeting was prepared by one of the members and distributed to all staff.)

IV. Data Collection and Feedback

COPED strategy called for the collection of information by means of written questionnaires from all administrative staff and from a sample of teachers and students before interventions were undertaken. These data were to be fed back to various staff groups (beginning with the top group) as a basis for diagnosis and problem-solving. They were also to be used by the COPED staff in studying the interrelations among organizational variables as they relate to change and in describing the system at the time the project began.

Plans called for key members of the school system to work with the COPED staff in determining what data should be collected. This was to be done in part at a planning meeting in the Spring of 1966 and in part at the summer one-week workshop. Neither of these actions materialized. The fact that the national COPED plan called for all centers to use the same "core instruments, and the fact that agreement regarding the core instruments had not been worked out among the COPED centers, led the New York staff to postpone meetings with the school system personnel on this question during the spring of 1966. Since the Old City group did not participate in the summer workshop, the issue could not be explored there. Once agreement among COPED centers was reached (in the fall of 1966), the pressures were strong to administer the questionnaires immediately.

The questionnaires were reviewed with the Superintendent and Board in October. One change was made at the request of the superintendent, and approval was given to administer them. The requested change was in a questionnaire to be filled out by fifth-grade and eleventh-grade pupils. The particular items dealt with the presence or absence of the father in the home. It was argued that the items were "sensitive" and there had been complaints a year earlier from civil rights groups about another questionnaire in another project.

COPED staff members and the Assistant Superintendent met with all principals to explain the way data-gathering fitted into COPED work and to formulate specific plans for the administration of the instruments. Teachers and a sample of students were then administered the questionnaires with little discussion of purposes or use.

To most of the teachers and all of the students, the questionnaires were their first involvement with COPED (the exceptions were teachers who had been at Ontario or had served on the Advisory Committee). Information reported by members of the Advisory Committee and from teachers with whom COPED staff members talked at later meetings, indicated that a few teachers thought the question asked in the instruments were important and that they found filling them out was provocative, but that many were irritated by having to take them, questioned their validity, and felt negatively toward COPED.

The only data from the core instruments which were fed back to members of the system immediately were the responses of high school department heads to three of the questions. These data were studied by the administrative staff of the high school as part of an orientation to COPED. This seemed to generate considerable interest in the data, but plans to continue the general feedback were not supported by plans developed by the Advisory Committee.

The core instruments were administered again in June, 1967 to the people who took them originally.

V. Building Level Problem-Solving

A. Getting Started

As indicated above, the approach to self-renewal worked out by the Advisory Committee identified the school buildings as the focal unit for change and systematic problem-solving as the major activity. One of the objectives of the Advisory Committee was to facilitate involvement of all professional staff in the operation of the school system. To implement this, the Committee decided to ask each building faculty to select teachers to serve with the building administrators as a "COPED team" to plan and carry out the problem-solving work in each building.

In order to launch the building work, two facilitating steps were subsequently planned: to hold meetings with all professional staff to familiarize them with the plans and to conduct workshops to help the leadership teams (principal and teachers) prepare for their work.

The specific objectives of the orientation meetings were to inform the whole staff about the approach being taken, to familiarize them with the concept of COPED, to enable them to select teacher representatives, and to generate enthusiasm for the idea of building level problem-solving.

As a first step in orienting all staff to the plan, the Cabinet and COPED members met with all principals. After being brought up-to-date on the current state of COPED affairs, and on the general approach the Advisory Committee had recommended, they were asked if they wanted to hold orientation meetings with their own staffs or if they preferred that COPED staff do so. The principals came up with the idea of forming clusters, each consisting of a junior high and the elementary schools whose pupils later attended the junior high school, and of having COPED staff meet with each cluster to explain the plan. This idea was accepted by those present at the meeting, and a series of cluster meetings was held in January, 1967. These meetings, each of about one hour, consisted of a short lecture about the concept of COPED, and of separate meetings of each building staff with a COPED staff member, during which each group was briefly engaged in a demonstration of group problem-identification, then each was asked to select a teacher to serve on the building leadership team.

B. Leadership training for building-level problem-solving

The workshop consisted of two phases: a two-day off-the-job training session and a two-hour meeting of each building leadership team to formulate specific plans for conducting the first building meeting, utilizing their learning from the workshops. All administrators and approximately 50 teachers participated in one or the other of the two workshops. Part of each school's or each high school department's leadership personnel came to each in order that not too many people would be away from the school at one time. This plan necessitated the further plan for the leaders from each building to get together back at the schools after the workshops to formulate specific plans for working with their colleagues.

By the end of the workshops, the COPED staff hoped that each building leadership team (which consisted of the principal, other administrators, if any, in the building, and from one to four teachers, depending on the size of the school) would:

1. be clear regarding the purposes of COPED and the place of building/department work within these purposes;
2. be clear regarding responsibility of the building/department leadership teams;
3. have some alternatives for ways each leadership team could work with its staff teams;
4. have some clear expectations regarding problems likely to be encountered in building/department work;
5. have developed relations across role groups which would facilitate effective COPED work; and
6. be ready for a subsequent meeting of each total building/department leadership team to coordinate future plans.

As these objectives indicate, the workshop focused explicitly upon helping building teams prepare for the problem-solving sessions they were to conduct with their faculties. How effectively was this done? One of the COPED staff (Buchanan, n.d.) made a detailed analysis of the workshops, and concluded that some progress was made in formulating plans for the administrators and teachers to work together with the building staff, in developing some specific actions the teams might take in working with their faculties; and he concluded that some learning had occurred regarding the importance of openness of communication and regarding ways of exerting and receiving influence across hierarchical levels. He also concluded that "the main weakness of the workshops was the strategy of which they were a part -- to require all building administrative staffs to participate, and then to depend so much for success on a two-day meeting."

C. Building-level activities

As part of the Advisory Committee's plan, each building team was to hold at least one meeting of its faculty during the spring (1967) to begin the problem-solving process. Anticipating that some problems could be solved at the building level while others would be system-wide and require action at higher levels, and in order to stimulate interchange among buildings, the Advisory Committee asked each building (and high school department) to submit to it by May 10th a report on problems identified and on progress. An Advisory Sub-Committee was formed to integrate the reports and to prepare a newsletter informing all staff of the major issues identified and the work done. Examination of these reports provided an important source of information regarding the impact of COPED.

In the high school, 8 of the 10 departments held at least one meeting. Three indicated that they planned further activities. One met twice and then held a conference in conjunction with the junior high schools. One department concluded it had no problems.

Eleven of the fifteen elementary schools reported meeting at least once and there was indication that perhaps five of them were "turned on. One held weekly meetings of the principal and those teachers who wished to attend, then the group which met reported periodically to the whole staff. One planned how to use COPED "core instrument" responses as a means of identifying problems and planned to obtain appropriate data from the COPED staff. One held two meetings of the total staff, then formed an action committee to follow through on the issues identified.

Of the 5 junior high schools, two held four meetings, one held three, one held two, and one held one meeting of the total group but had continuing meetings of the leadership team. It appears that, despite the size and complexity of the junior high schools (three of them were K through 9, and all had staffs of more than 50 teachers), they became the most active. Perhaps it is useful to describe the procedure followed by one junior high school team (as described in its report on May 10th):

March 30 -	Change agents (i.e., teacher members) met with the administrators and were told they could proceed in whatever manner they thought proper. (The administrators left the meeting at this point.)

The change agents divided the faculty into 3 groups with a change agent as chairman of each. At the first meeting, teachers were to be asked to identify areas in which improvements were desired and needed.

April 3 - The 3 groups met and identified problem areas, which were recorded. It was agreed that this initial meeting would not allow discussion but merely identification of problems.

April 5 - The change agents met and consolidated the problems from the 3 groups into one list, in order of importance as indicated by majority of teachers. They decided to notify the administrators and teachers of the list.

April 10 - The 3 groups of teachers met to make recommendations about the highest priority problems.

April 13 - Change agents presented the list of problems and the teachers' recommendations regarding the high priority problems to the administrators. These were received with an interested, friendly, cooperative attitude by the administrators.

April 27 - Change agents discussed the discipline problems in the school with the administrator who was unable to attend the April 13 meeting. Further discussion by the change agents and all of the administrators was set for May 11.

In the fall of 1967, several schools were intensively continuing their problem-solving work. A full report was planned by the Advisory Committee sub-committee for January, 1968.

D. Intensive training for selected internal change agents

During the summer of 1967, three people (a teacher, an elementary principal, and a junior high principal) attended a five-week training program in Bethel, Maine designed to prepare school personnel to serve as consultants on organizational change and in-service training in their school systems. At the time of this writing, plans were under way to provide role assignments for these people to perform.

VI. Discussion

What had been accomplished so far in Old City as a result of COPED? This question was discussed by the Advisory Committee and a COPED staff member in October, 1967. While members could not be sure how much of the changes they noted were attributable to COPED, they mentioned that COPED had definitely resulted in their identifying, consolidating, and sharing what all professional staff thought their problems were. They were referring to the list prepared by the sub-group of the Advisory Committee and presented in the Newsletter. It was felt that the Advisory Committee provided a structure or a vehicle for resolving problems of system-wide nature, and it provided building staffs a vehicle for working on building problems. Advisory Committee members said that COPED had also considerably increased the involvement of teachers in the operation of their schools. Then, a large number of improvements were identified on the issues listed in the Newsletter. When someone asked if the staff had developed the skills and resources for continuing work on their own, the general response was that they had acquired this only to a limited extent. This discussion, however, led to the question of how well the Advisory Committee knew the building teams' needs for skills and resources.

The outcome of the meeting was a plan by which the Committee would (a) inform all staff about what had been done thus far on the system-wide problems identified, (b) find out what skills needed to be worked on, and (c) find out what help building teams thought they needed. Then the Committee would attempt to provide leadership in working on the issues needing work and obtain the help required by the building teams.

In its initial statement of strategy, COPED listed some short range criteria by which movement toward self-renewal could be gauged (Miles and Lake, 1967). While analysis of the core instrument data will provide a more systematic assessment, the following seem to be a reasonable description of accomplishment on each criteria.

1. Improved effectiveness of problem-solving. Some improvement was attained in several of the building staffs, in the system's curriculum committee, and possibly in the Advisory Committee.

2. High self-sustaining motivation of members to accomplish the goals of their groups. The most relevant place to look for this is in the Cabinet and the Advisory Committee, since these groups are giving direction to the self-renewal effort. Indications are that motivation is not yet self-sustaining, the Cabinet meets only when a COPED representative initiates it, and the Advisory Committee has met only in response to action by the Cabinet.

3. A climate supportive of effective job performance. There has been improvement in this in some of the buildings in that teachers have a means for exerting some influence and for helping identify and solve problems.

4. Structures and procedures which facilitate self renewal. This is the area of most accomplishment and most promise for further self-renewal. The Cabinet, Advisory Committee, building leader teams, business office *ad hoc* committee, long-range planning committee, Newsletter committee, and the Director of Special Services are new structures which can support or facilitate self renewal. Three key members have received special training in consultant skills, and roles are being worked out from which they can contribute. The Newsletter (and the committee which prepares it) provides a procedure for publicizing information about self-renewal activity, for listing problems and progress -- and for making commitments which elicit action.

5. Belief that one's contributions count. In looking over the actions which were taken on the basis of recommendations from the task forces and the building teams, personnel cannot help but notice that while the wheels of change grind slowly, individuals' ideas did make some difference.

No information is available regarding change in the long-range criterion (impact on the students), but given the stage of planned change the project had reached at the time this report was prepared, no change in student behavior could be expected.

REFERENCES

Buchanan, Paul. "Old City Leadership Training Workshop," Intervention Report No. VI, New York City COPED (mimeographed) n.d.

Buchanan, Paul C. "The Concept of Organization Development or Self-Renewal as a Form of Planned Change", in Watson G. (ed.) Concepts for Social Change, Washington D.C.: National Training Laboratories, 1967.

Miles, M. and Lake D. "Self-Renewal in School Systems: A Strategy of Planned Change", in Watson, G. (ed.) Concepts for Social Change, Washington, D.C.: National Training Laboratories, 1967.

Watson, G. "Toward a Conceptual Architecture of Self-Renewing School System" in Watson, G. (ed.) Change in School Systems, Washington D.C., National Training Laboratories, 1967.

Lake, D.G. "Self-Renewal in Schools: Some Concepts and Examples," paper read at annual meeting of American Orthopsychiatric Association, Inc. March, 1967.

COPED IN BUCKLEY

by

T. M. Stephens

Stage I*: Contact, Clarification and Commitment

The first contact between the Buckley school system and the New York Region COPED team was in December, 1965, when representatives of approximately twenty school systems were invited to a conference on educational innovation. The purposes of this meeting were: (a) to clarify the idea of planned change in school systems, (b) to aid teams from the systems to diagnose some of their own problems, (c) to give the COPED staff an idea of the change problems in these systems, and (d) to build a basis for further contact between COPED and the local school systems. The design included discussion of COPED and the concept of self-renewal, and the application of a problem-solving technique to the participants' school systems.

Subsequent to this, the Buckley system was one of five invited by New York COPED to attend a meeting in mid-February in which further clarification was given on COPED's goals and methods, and the mutual responsibilities of involvement with school systems. The Buckley delegation, consisting of the assistant superintendent, two principals and several teachers, gave COPED a "go-ahead" in principle at this time.

A brief description of the Buckley school system may be useful at this point. Buckley is a town of 11,000 with a homogeneously white, upper-middle class population. The system consists of seven schools: a senior and junior high, two intermediate schools and three elementary schools. About 80% of the 3,000 students are college-bound.

The next event of significance in the Buckley chronology was not, in fact, directly connected with COPED, but it was to have a direct influence on later developments by creating mistrust and suspicion of COPED's methods. This event was the St. Valentine's Day Massacre" of 1966, a one-day workshop held at the invitation of the Buckley superintendent of schools*** to acquaint system personnel with laboratory methods and introduce innovation into the system. Participants consisted of fifteen administrators and 150 teachers.

---

* This account will follow as closely as possible the stages outlined in Miles and Lake's strategy paper.** It should be noted that (a) the present strategy differs from the original in certain respects, (b) the stages naturally overlap and do not occur as sequential steps, and (c) the different stages last for varying amounts of time.

** Miles, Matthew B. and Lake, Dale G., "Self-Renewal in School Systems: A Strategy for Planned Change" in Goodwin Watson (ed.), Concepts for Social Change. (Washington: National Training Laboratories, 1967.)

*** who had attended Bethel the previous summer.

While not considered immediately successful (57% of the participants felt dissatisfied), the workshop nevertheless proved to be useful to COPED as a diagnosis of system problems. Moreover, one-third of the participants did express satisfaction with the lab, and the Board and superintendent continued their interest in COPED.

In mid-April, the Administrative Council (consisting of the superintendent, his assistant and the principals) expressed a desire for continued contact with COPED. Formal, written commitment came in mid-June.

Stages II & III: Problem-Sensing and Diagnosis

On March 21, there was a meeting of the Administrative Council with the COPED staff. This managerial body was the original focal group for the project and the Problem Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ)* was administered to it and also to a small sample of teachers on that day. It was here that the severe mistrust and suspicion in the system became even more apparent in two ways: first, the questionnaire answers made this explicit and second, the administrators refused to share their results with the teachers.

A planning committee was then formed to decide further steps, especially on sharing the PAQ results. A separate meeting of administrators on April 4 finally decided to release the quantitative data, but not without strong reservations from the assistant superintendent and the withholding of the qualitative data which consisted of verbatim comments (many of which were sharply critical of the administration).

At this time, a significant new strategy was adopted. Since it was felt that the Administrative Council was a decision-making body without sufficient access to all levels of the system, a "steering committee" was developed from the planning committee and it met in mid-April for the first time. This new body cut across all the role groups in Buckley and included a board member, the superintendent, co-ordinators, principals, and teachers, all schools being represented. Its general purpose was to plan the direction of further COPED activities; one of its first functions was to publish a newsletter to keep all Buckley staff informed about COPED.

At the end of April, a one-day off-site meeting with the Administrative Council was held at COPED's suggestion. This was another departure from the original scheme which called for such a workshop for one week in the summer. However, problems of mistrust in the system were so severe, especially with the superintendent, that such immediate action was warranted. Most of the sessions were devoted to improving decision-making processes and considered such problems as teacher hiring. It appears that the workshop was useful in beginning to open up communication, and in laying groundwork for the summer meeting.

---

* See Appendix I.

The PAQ was administered again in June. The Steering Committee felt this was necessary because they considered the March data neither reliable nor valid: attitudes had changed since the first administration and only a fraction of the teachers had originally been tested. In addition, there was a "Buckley Teacher Questionnaire"* developed in conjunction with the Steering Committee, which probed job satisfaction, communication problems, and the fate of innovative suggestions. Responses to this questionnaire indicated strong mistrust and suspicion of the superintendent on the part of the teachers. His improved relations with the Administrative Council obviously had not generalized to the teachers as a group.

To summarize the effects of six months of contact between COPED and Buckley: a great deal of time had been spent on problem-sensing and diagnosis through the two administrations of the PAQ, the development of the Buckley Teacher Questionnaire, and several meetings of the Administrative Council and the newly formed Steering Committee.

As of June, 1966, the most severe** problems seen in common by administrators and teachers were: inadequate decision-making by the administration, including arbitrary and too-rapid decisions from above; a poor working relationship between the central office and the principals; a lack of time to get at one's job; and insufficient follow-through on changes.

Additional problems seen as critical by the administrators only were: a lack of clear objectives and goals; apprehension and mistrust in the system; a lack of clarity about authority and responsibility; low teacher morale; and conflict or hostility between groups or individuals.

Those problems rated highly by teachers but not administrators reflect their professional orientation: inadequate staff for needed services; a tendency to placate the community; lack of respect; lack of agreement with administrators on discipline; excessive non-professional work; and an inadequate and outmoded curriculum.

The most striking finding of the Buckley Teacher Questionnaire was the pronounced attrition of ideas at all levels; over half the new ideas people had were never passed on to another person; follow-through on passed-on ideas was seen as minimal.

---

* See Appendix II.

** Problems listed here had a mean score of less than 3.5 (on a scale of 1 to 7) on the PAQ. The average of the two means was used for problems shared by the teachers and administrators.

Stage IV: Off-Site Summer Workshop

As early as mid-May, there was discussion as to who should attend the summer workshop. At that time, the superintendent pushed hard for the Administrative Council, expressing the feeling that it was they who needed the experience. At a Steering Committee meeting of June 1, the superintendent announced his arbitrary decision to include a Board member in the workshop. He also managed to demonstrate the apparent concurrence of COPED in this decision (which was not in fact the case). This was a good example of "arbitrary...decision-making from above" and it reinforced feelings of mistrust not only against the superintendent but also against COPED. When confronted by COPED with his manipulative behavior, the superintendent expressed some guilt feelings but did little to rectify the situation.

The workshop took place from August 16 to 19, and was attended by eleven participants: the superintendent and two assistants, seven principals and one Board member. Four COPED staff were present.

The general objectives for the session were: (a) to improve interpersonal relations and build a working team; (b) to look at the data from the PAQ and the Buckley Teacher Questionnaire and diagnose problems in the system and one's own role; (c) to solve some problems and make designs and plans; and (d) to make plans to recommend to the Steering Committee for the next steps in the COPED project.

The design of the workshop was built around a consideration of problems in the Buckley system, with this problem-solving work used as a vehicle for building relationships and improving skills. Three of the sessions were run as Administrative Council meetings, alternating between trios and the whole body as work groups. The main topics discussed were superintendent-Board communication and coordinator-principal relations. Techniques used in other sessions included a "fishbowl" exercise (half the group observing the rest at work), expressing authentic positive feelings toward one another, listing "Here & Now" and "There and Then problems, and receiving feedback from reactionnaires.

During the course of the four days, there was noticeable progress made in the sphere of interpersonal relations, with communication becoming more open and the superintendent in particular becoming more expressive and acceptant of criticism without taking the defensive.

In a Steering Committee about a week after this workshop, the teachers present remarked on the noticeable changes in the administrators' behavior, and pressed for their own off-site meeting.

Stage V: Building Relations and Skills in Other Groups

After the summer of 1966, the emphasis shifted from working with the Administrative Council as a focal group to other bodies, notably the Steering Committee.

As noted above, the teacher-members of the Steering Committee requested a workshop (for the entire group) which was held on September 21 and 22. One difficulty experienced at this lab was an implied distinction between those who had attended the August session (administrators) and those who hadn't (teachers). This and other problems were worked out to the group's general satisfaction.

Shortly after this, it was announced that the superintendent was resigning (to take up an appointment with wider responsibilities). While he claimed a large personal interest and investment in COPED, it is still not clear whether or not he left Buckley due to the persistent and strong criticism directed at him.

On October 13, there was the first of a series of meetings at the building level to discuss the PAQ and the Buckley Teacher Questionnaire data generated the previous June. The faculty of each building considered the data of both their own school and the total system and thus were able to analyze their specific problems and compare them with the system in general. A second such round of meetings was held in mid-November with generally positive responses. Teacher councils were formed in some buildings to plan and carry-out future faculty meetings.

The first core package of instruments was administered in the fall of 1966: children were tested on October 25, and adults on November 1 and 3. Data from this administration are coded and punched, but not yet analyzed due to processing problems.

On December 12 and 13, a second off-site meeting was held for the Steering Committee, concentrating specifically on self-renewal: setting change goals and considering change-supporting structures. Mixed feelings regarding COPED came out at this meeting: while most members were basically enthusiastic, some were mistrustful that relationships worked out in the off-site meetings would not carry-over to the working situation. Some dissension and lack of interest were noted in the system, probably due to a continued misconception of COPED as a problem-solving agency with ready-made solutions. There was still a strong tendency to rely on the COPED staff for direction, encouragement and solutions. Examples of new solutions or structures not suggested or directly inspired by COPED were rare.

At this workshop, the appointment of the new superintendent was announced by the Board member present. The new man was described as "innovative and direct," a distinct contrast to his predecessor. This selection turned out to be instrumental in developing COPED into an innovative system.

Calendar 1967 showed a marked decline in COPED contact with Buckley, except for a brief flurry of activity in March and April. There were two reasons for this: during January and February, the change-over of superintendents forced a lull, and by mid-April funding problems were becoming apparent and the COPED staff initiated fewer activities, with the knowledge that contact on a continued basis might soon cease altogether.

On March 3 and 4, the Buckley School Board (including the new superintendent) held an off-site meeting which was regarded by the COPED staff as highly successful. The goals of this meeting were: to develop increased respect for the superintendent as an educational leader; to explore ways of improving procedures in meetings; to develop group cohesiveness; and to learn more about COPED as an innovative force.

During March, two junior COPED staff members proposed a workshop at the building level.* This offer was accepted by a principal who was a Steering Committee member, and a demonstration one-hour "micro-lab" was run for the entire building faculty on March 24. This emphasized the "Here & Now," and employed exercises such as feeding-back immediate impressions of others, and having the fantasy of saying something in a staff meeting that one had never dared say before. The actual workshop (for about two-thirds of the faculty) was held a month later and was a two-day off-site meeting. This lab was regarded by COPED staff as successfully opening-up communication and developing problem-solving skills. Three follow-up meetings took place from early May to early June. The next effect of the lab, plus follow-up work, appeared to be that of moving most of the faculty in a more innovative direction, while sharpening "radical-conservative conflict among the faculty somewhat.

Stage VI: Gathering Momentum

With the holding of an intensive workshop at the building level, it appeared that enthusiasm for change and a climate of innovation were gradually becoming established in Buckley.

During May, a new body called the Design Committee was formed; it was suggested to the Steering Committee by COPED. About half its members were new to COPED activities. Its specific task was to investigate the present status in the school system and make suggestions for new structures and processes to better solve recognized problems. COPED staff supplied a work grid to aid this process.** One of the committee's first products was a pamphlet entitled, "Where Does My Idea Go From Here?"

On May 11, the core package was administered for the second time; data from it are not yet analyzed due to a long delay by the firm doing coding and punching work (delivery finally effected on October 30).

Further indices of gathering momentum in Buckley were several extended building meetings held over the summer, called by the principals to discuss specific school problems. Such summer activities had rarely included teachers in the past.

Two of the principals attended Bethel over the summer and were highly enthusiastic about their experience.

---

*As an intern project through National Training Laboratories.

**See Appendix III.

During the spring and summer of 1967, the roles of Director of Instruction and coordinators were clarified and expanded, providing persons to coordinate curriculum throughout the high school and junior high school levels and act as consultants to the elementary schools. This was a major structural change initiated and executed by the superintendent, with minimal assistance from COPED.

Stage VII: Withdrawal of COPED

In late May of 1967, COPED announced its intention to withdraw from active collaboration with Buckley to being simply "on call" and available as needed. At an Administrative Council meeting on October 11, this was reiterated and the Council welcomed the change with confidence and enthusiasm about carrying on by themselves. The feeling expressed was one of prideful success in the progress made over the last two years and a frank recognition that neither COPED nor the Steering Committee was any longer necessary to Buckley.

Discussion

There is no question that improvements in Buckley over the past two years have been great; communication has been definitely facilitated, trust has been established, and problem-solving skills have been developed.

However, some difficulty has been experienced in translating the success of the various workshops to the working situation. Virtually all of the off-site workshops were considered by the COPED staff as successfully opening-up communication and developing problem-solving skills, and yet the positive effects on the total system were very slow in coming. This may be due, in part, to the fact that the working situation necessitated interaction between those who had been to workshops and those who had not, and there continued to be some mistrust and skepticism from the latter group regarding COPED and COPED-type activities. An example of this is the suspicion of the administration registered by the teachers in the June PAQ, even after the off-site workshop of the administrators in April. To illustrate the notion that workshop experience tended to set certain individuals and bodies apart, one need only look at the distinction made in the September Steering Committee workshop between those who had attended the August session and those who hadn't.

A distinct benefit to Buckley was the appointment of the new superintendent. COPED appears to have had some influence on this personnel change, since they set certain criteria for a new superintendent as a condition for further collaboration; these criteria were met by the Board. It is also instructive to note that the new superintendent was first brought to the Board's attention by one of the teachers; such communication would probably have been unlikely or impossible before COPED entered the system.

While the New York Region COPED team spent an estimated total of 42 man-days in direct contact with Buckley, it is difficult to estimate the importance of COPED's role in the above-mentioned changes, and the success of the project in general.

At least three factors hinder such an assessment: (a) changes in strategy during the course of the project, (b) an important personnel change, and (c) funding difficulties toward the end of the project.

Not only were there shifts in strategy during the course of the project, but contact with Buckley was initiated before the strategy was firmly established. While strategy changes have not been emphasized in this account, some of the more important were mentioned (e.g., the early Administrative Council workshop, the establishment of the Steering and Design Committees). These changes make it difficult to assess the effectiveness of the originally-planned design.

Two points can be made about the change in superintendents. First, the lack of continuity of leadership means accurate assessment of the strategy is not possible, and second, the new superintendent was himself innovative and served to develop the system further, independently of COPED.

Funding difficulties in a sense also forced a change in strategy as COPED's withdrawal came somewhat earlier than planned. Furthermore, even the spectre of these difficulties meant a less intense involvement for COPED for the last six months of the project.

In any case, assessing the strategy and ascribing causes will have to wait for data on specific changes in the school system, which will be provided by analysis of the core package results. Moreover, an accurate assessment of COPED's role required collection data from Buckley some months after the end of active collaboration with the system.

COMSTOCK SCHOOL BUILDING*

by

Avis Manno

INTRODUCTION

Comstock School is a "middle school", grades 3 to 6. The faculty is composed of 18 classroom teachers, 4 specialists, and the principal. The principal and a teacher had been involved with COPED work for about a year as members of the Wilton school system steering committee when the subject of our working with a faculty group in one of the schools was raised by a member of the COPED staff. We followed this with a letter detailing how a program in the school might be set up. Several months later some informal discussions between the two steering committee members and the COPED staff member moved the project closer to a real beginning. The principal described his staff as "split between older teachers and young teachers" commenting, "I've been so depressed lately. This will give me something to look forward to. I really need something to look forward to." We were told also that in faculty meetings some of the teachers had said they were interested in working on the problem of discipline in the school.

Our suggestion was that we introduce our ways of working to the faculty with a micro-lab for the entire faculty, and at this micro-lab we spell out how we envision a series of meetings taking place. A date was set for the micro-lab.

The over-all initial goals for the entire program were identified by three COPED staff members on the basis of information gained from conversations with steering committee members, an informal visit to the school to talk with teachers, and some data gleaned from the instruments in the core package. The COPED goals also influenced the setting of goals for this specific project. These goals were for the staff:

- To open communication of feelings between teachers and principal re: preferred roles for the principal.
- To work collaboratively on real school-wide problems.
- To open communication of feelings among teachers for working on classroom problems.
- To understand one's own patterns of behavior in the group.
- To give and receive help regarding classroom work.

---

*This building was located in the Buckley system.

This report is the account of the following events that made up the program:

1. A micro-lab for the entire faculty
2. A two-day off-site lab for volunteers
3. Three follow-up 2-hour meetings at the school for the entire faculty

I. THE MICRO-LAB

The goals noted above served as the backdrop for the micro-lab, to which we added our specific hopes for the faculty:

- To gain information about the project.
- To decide individually upon attending an off-site meeting.
- To experience our work style.
- To build trust and confidence in us.
- To begin the process of being open.
- To give data to be used for designing the remainder of the program.

The micro-lab was conducted by two COPED trainers working with 18 teachers and the principal.

The design is shown on the left below. Staff observations and discussion are present on the right.

The events (highlights)	Our observations and some comments
1. Setting up. We set up chairs in groups of 4 and 5 around the room and chatted with the principal and the teacher steering committee member. Teachers from each grade level were asked to distribute themselves into the groups. The principal joined a group.	1. The principal commented to us on how hard it is to get teachers involved. He mentioned a one-afternoon training program a year earlier that had threatened many people. Teachers joked. Someone asked, "Are we here to play games? Did someone bring a bottle?"
2. Introduction of trainers. The principal made a joke about the trainers having "pedigrees" and said this was an opportunity for teachers to learn more about COPED. He said, "The COPED work can help us to do what we want to do anyway."	2. One trainer's notes on this introduction read, "I feel this to be a half-hearted introduction with no expression of commitment on Larry's part to COPED or our proposed workshop." The other's notes say the introduction sounded like a dodge and the word "anyway" had a "1, 9 quality" to it.

3. Presentation of the whole plan. After the introduction, a trainer began by saying that she knew the teachers had identified problems and then nothing had been done about solving them. She, therefore, proposed a two-day workshop first to open communication so that the group could then go on to actually work out solutions to the problems. This might be followed by four follow-up meetings to check and see if the solutions were working out satisfactorily and to invent new solutions if necessary. And last, it was recommended that there be a one-day workshop to make plans for next year's problem-solving.

She then described the staff's goals for this teachers' meeting as giving them enough experience with the trainers' style of work and the kinds of tasks that would occur during a two-day lab to make up their minds whether or not they would like to take part in the two-day lab. The second goal was to build a relationship between the Comstock staff and the trainers, and the third goal was to begin collecting data to be used in the two-day lab and to begin to work more openly with each other. One trainer re-emphasized this two-fold goal of interpersonal work and problem identification.

4. Here and now feelings. Participants were asked to talk about "How are you feeling about being at this faculty meeting right now?" (3 min.). In a general session the participants were asked if they were able to express feelings. Some people reported "yes" but others shook their heads in disagreement. Participants were asked to try again to be open about current feelings (3 min.). General session (1 min.), "Was it easier?"

4. Mostly polite conversation, some expression of distrust and annoyance with COPED. Throughout the design of this micro-lab and subsequent events we planned to re-cycle, as we did here. There were reports in the second general sessions that it was easier to talk about current feelings.

5. "Touch and tell each person how you really feel about him." (10 min.) Some people said they touched children but not adults. In the general session a few people reported on how difficult it was to think of things to say to each other.	5. There was much giggling. We thought the session was stilted. One person asked why they had to touch each other. We also say support and caring; no hostility.
6. "Imagine yourself saying something in a faculty meeting that you have never dared to say before--close your eyes to do this--don't say it--and imagine the response you get from the staff." Reports were: (3 min.). "Doubtful," "disbelief," "dead silence," "anger," "a round of applause," "stoney silence," "shock."	6. People seemed to be quite satisfied with this exercise; probably "closer to the job."
7. "Say in your group one thing you have never dared to say before a faculty meeting--it need not be the same thing you just imagined yourself saying." (5 min.) Some things that were said in the small groups were: "Children are too wild in the halls. We need specific rules." "Some people talk too much at meetings." "Why do some people talk just to talk?" "You're creating a problem in your end of the building." "If I say what I want to say, there will be retribution." "We do hold back and not say what we think." "Faculty meetings have little to do with classroom teaching." In the general session (1 min.) we asked how their comments had been accepted. Reports were that their comments were generally approved of and evoked interest. We pointed out the possible discrepancy between what may be anticipated as response to open comments and the actual response.	7. Here seemed to come some of the first real, genuine feelings. "The job" permitted teachers to express a lot of affect, perhaps more than did being asked to talk about feelings. We both thought they were really working here--all but one group who later characterized by the principal as "die-hards." The themes that were raised seem to arise in many elementary schools of different sizes and located in widely different communities. There seemed to be a non-verbal acceptance of this notion of the discrepancy between anticipated others' responses and actual responses. Later during the question and answer period a teacher referred to this and said they could really fix their problems all by themselves.
8. Assessing school problems. Participants were asked individually to jot down on a 3 x 5 card their most important problem about teaching in this school (1 min.). Next they were asked to pool their problems	8. One person said, "We've done all this before." This was probably an appropriate comment in that we said in the introduction that they had assessed problems and could not carry

in the small groups and write the most important problems on newsprint (5 min.). Participants were then asked to reflect silently on "How would it be towork in this school if the problems were solved?" (1 min.) The problems identified were:

Group I

a. Scheduling special classes. Some are too short.
b. Don't go along with the amount of freedom given to students and teachers. Too relaxed.
c. Providing for individual differences.
d. Lack of sufficient time and materials to adequately handle individual differences.

Group II

a. Discipline in the classroom and in the school itself.
b. Arranging for individual help within the classroom.
c. Communication.
d. Time!!!

Group III

a. Lack of set rules (consistency) for students which result in discipline problems.
b. Faculty meetings with no clear objectives.
c. Special teacher problems.

Group IV

a. Lack of direction in field of Science.
b. Lack of sharing ideas, abilities, experiences.
c. Lack of evaluation and improvement of methods.
d. Improvement in use of special aids.
e. Overcoming resistance.

them through. Our design probably confirmed this because it did not contain any steps beyond assessment. The principal later referred to the "die-hards" problems as "rather academic" issues rather than real problems.

9. PMR. "Rank this meeting on a scale from 1 to 7 where 1 means unsatisfactory, 4 means 'so-so' and 7 means satisfactory." Rating was done on the same 3 x 5 cards. The participants were also asked to write one or two adjectives that comment on or describe the meaning of the ratings (5 min.). Ratings and comments are presented below:

Rating	Comment
1	Typical Wilton public school foolishness.
2	
3	Questionable, inaccurate, forced.
3	Bored--We have had several meetings on this nature before. Repetition. No results are accomplished. We always identified problems, but nothing is done.
3	Perplexing, unsatisfying.
3	Frustrated, bored, forced.
3	Preparation, wasted time, most lists the same.
3	Time well spent.
3	Vague.
3	Oblique, playing games.
4	Interesting.
4	Unimpressed as yet. Psychologically sound (probably). Structured.
4	Different, informal.
4	Not relative, too abstract, rousing.
5	Vague but full of possibility, encouraging.
5	Revealing, realistic, purposeless because nothing will be done about it.
5	Unfaltering stubborness but also openness (of which there is a greater amount), A O. K.
6	Relieved yet still a little dubious. Can see some propose now.
7	Commencement. The beginning of purposefulness.

10. Micro-break (5 min.)	10. As the trainers tallied the cards, the teachers walked to the other end of the room. We had wanted to get a third person to do the tallying, but were unable to. We were sorry to miss the informal conversation.
11. Feedback of PMR results (2 min.) The mean response was 3.7. All the comments were read back with no evaluative judgements. The range of ratings was shown.	11. We thought the teachers were surprised that we read the negative comments and were somewhat embarrassed but pleased.
12. Questions and answers about COPED. Some questions were: "Why was Comstock singled out and by whom?" "How did COPED get started?" "Are we the only school...?" "Why do you think we need help more than other schools?" "We have no problems here." "This kind of thing might be helpful in the classroom?" "Why ...working only with top brass... Why haven't you been working with the teachers when we're the only ones who can do something about how things go in the classroom?" "Don't you think we can solve our own problems without your help?" "Why do we need a workshop?" "Are our problems like those from other schools?"	12. Some of the questions were questions. Other comments began as questions and ended as opinions. We answered questions as openly as we could. We accepted the challenging questions-statements and responded, sometimes by giving information, sometimes by saying we had no real information but felt we could help them to gather data to determine whether what was being raised was really an issue or not. Both trainers reported later that they felt good about this part of the session.
13. Next steps. We asked for a straw poll as to who might be interested in an off-site two-day workshop. We asked the participants to fill out an unsigned instrument to be mailed back to us by them at a later date. The instrument requested that participants respond to 4 items. The items and a summary of the responses received are presented below: 1. Please identify the two or three things about the Comstock School which help teachers to do an effective, creative job of teaching. There were 8 comments such as these: Freedom. Free rein to innovate. Encouragement to try new ideas and ways of teaching. The freedom exists which allows one to try creative ideas. No strict	13. Twelve teachers indicated interest in the follow-up. (14 eventually came.) Our own reactions to the micro-lab were very positive. We felt we saw a good deal of resistance but also a firm desire by some to work--mainly the younger teachers, and a few of the older teachers, too.

restrictions on curriculum. Freedom to do new things, make suggestions, and think for yourself. Freedom to experiment within the classroom. An atmosphere in which creativity and innovation are encouraged.

There were 4 comments such as these: Complete lack of fear of administration--principal is very cordial. The attitude of Mr. Grose, his confidence in his teachers, not only expressed but lived. Principal's faith and encouragement in allowing teachers to pursue their teaching in their own way. Absence of harrassment by principal.

There were 3 comments such as these: Staff always willing to give advice and share ideas. The help of Mrs. Borsani (sec't'y). Enthusiasm and ideas from a number of teachers. Three comments were: A friendly, helpful, relaxed feeling in the school. Relaxed atmosphere fostered by administration (although some teachers seem to create their own tense classrooms). Not pressured.

2. Please identify the two or three things about the Comstock School which make it difficult for teachers to do an effective, creative job of teaching. There were 4 comments such as these: Lack of joint planning and specializing at grade level. Some resistance to correlating creative interpretation with the curriculum. Lack of communication among teachers, hence lack of cooperation among teachers. Rigidity and resistance to any change from part of the staff. Inability of teachers to be open and work out differences.

There were 3 comments such as these: A lack of coordinated supplies. Lack of differentiated materials for all subject areas. Limited audio-visuals and other concrete learning materials. Supplies and repair of equipment a problem (believed principal should take a stronger role here and not let janitor have so much authority perhaps).

Three comments were: General lack of discipline. Lack of rules for children. Disciplinary problems.

3. What one thing about the Comstock School would you most like to see changed? In what way should it be changed? There were 3 comments such as these: Policy of excessive freedom children have. No set rules or regulations--not even flexible ones. Policy of excessive freedom results in disciplinary problems. More emphasis should be placed on childrens' thoughtfulness of and for teachers. What ways? Teachers; awareness of this and consistency in requiring a high standard of behavior. I would like to see a uniform system of discipline for kids and teachers. They should all know what is expected of them from September.

There were 2 comments such as these: Better leadership. A more organized leader. Intelligent decisiveness should be exercised by Mr. Grose.

4. What goals do you have for your own development as a teacher which you hope might be furthered by the workshop? There were 4 comments such as these: Learning what other teachers teach of or beyond the planned curriculum which they find successful--and identify parts of curriculum or tried personal plans which are weak. I am very interested in Language Arts and would be pleased if we could do some sharing of curriculum ideas

and teaching ideas. Increased specialization: more sharing; joint work by grade level teachers on new teaching methods and curriculum. To share different techniques or ways of teaching other teachers have found successful.

There were 2 comments such as these: Since I have always found it difficult to talk to large groups, I hope to gain confidence by talking in small groups. The scope of the workshop will widen my horizons, I hope. I would like to feel that I can gain the confidence to state my goals and values and support them. Here at this school, I have found myself rather inclined to keep my mouth shut; which is not my nature really, as I have sensed the power of the traditionalists and I haven't been too sure what's cooking around here.

II. THE TWO-DAY WORKSHOP

14 teachers and the principal came to an off-site two-day workshop. Substitutes were hired to replace the teachers. 8 teachers elected not to attend. Prior to the workshop, the entire faculty had determined that discipline should be worked on during the workshop.

The design for the first day was created by the trainers mainly to reflect the general human relations goals that had been established at the beginning of the program and by the needs that had been pointed up by the micro-lab and the data gained. On the first day, too, the design was made to include the discipline issue which was underscored as most significant during the micro-lab and the data. The design for the second day was created collaboratively with the principal to allow mainly for actual work on the discipline question.

Specific objectives for the two-day laboratory were for the faculty to:

Increase openness of communication re: classroom problems.

Increase openness of communication re: preferred role for the principal.

Increase confrontation of and awareness of the social work context.

Give and receive help re: classroom problems.

Become more initiating.

Increase understanding of interpersonal (teachers' and principal's behavior).

Study the principal's role.

The workshop was opened by a comment about a COPED staff member who was to serve as consultant to the two trainers. Participants were invited to read his notes or converse with him. The first event was to present on an easel a summary of the data gained from micro-lab questionnaires:

HELPS

Principal's faith in teachers' abilities.

Freedom to be creative, innovation.

Increasingly adequate supplies.

Relaxed atmosphere, effective library, librarian.

HINDRANCES

Discipline.

Supplies.

Relaxed atmosphere.

Need for joint planning.

Resistance to change, inertia.

There followed a brief introduction of the goals and the first day's schedule. Following this, the participants chose whether to be in a work group or an observing group for the first activity. The working group worked in a fishbowl. Observers were assigned individuals to observe. The work group was asked to diagnose the issue of the over-all work atmosphere in the school. After ten minutes the observers gave public reports of the behavior of the individuals they observed. The feedback dealt with the level of observed involvement and contribution. Some observers noted that there were evidences of jumping to solutions before the diagnosis was completed. The workers returned to their task and the observers looked to see if there were any changes in the workers' behavior. There was another feedback time and general discussion. In the general discussion the trainers attempted to clarify that this event demonstrated the twin focus of the lab--emphasis on human relations and on actual work.

After coffee, the process groups were formed. These had been created alphabetically. The process groups were modified T-groups. The emphasis was on the here and now. During the first process groups there was some authentic sharing of feelings but this was not very spirited. There was giving of feedback, expressing of doubts of the value of this sort of program, and in one group, casting of images of each other as children. In one group, a teacher said he suddenly realized that discipline and personality and adult relationships were "actually not far apart from each other." The principal, in his group said the teachers were a bunch of conformists and this was agreed to by the teachers.

Following lunch there was a general session on personal styles using a form that describes the "friendly helper," the "strong achiever," and the "logical thinker." People underlined behavior descriptions that they thought described themselves. The self descriptions were then checked by another person. The participants were very interested in this. There was a lot of excited and, we thought, interested discussion.

The process groups continued. The participants asked for feedback from others on how they perceived their style. Trainers had the impression that this went well, that there was authentic work going on.

The late afternoon was devoted to problem solving. Problem-solving steps were presented: (1) defining-sensing, (2) diagnosing, (3) proposing-brainstorm, (4) discussing-weighing, (5) planning. Three teachers observed using an observation guide that allowed for tally marks to be put in various spaces indicating the several steps (above) of the problem-solving sequence. The group chose to work on discipline. After 10 minutes the work was stopped for feedback from the observers. This work was difficult and often appeared to cycle around the same issues Several people presented their broad philosophical views and often inputs were made without apparent regard to what had just been said.

There were subsequent periods of feedback from the observers. It was then suggested that the group move along the problem-solving steps. Many specific suggestions were made. The general feeling on the part of COPED staff was that it was a hard, frustrating afternoon, probably caused in part by our over-active trainers. Moreover, the COPED staff felt there was not evidence of a good deal of learning from the observations and feedback.

Before the beginning of the evening events, the group was brought back to a review of the afternoon's problem-solving work. They were asked to write down their feelings about the problem solving. Some people said there was a good deal of beating around the bush and it took a long time to get started. Others pointed out that this was necessary. It was suggested that the group tried to get at too many problems at once. There was general agreement that there was greater participation than was found at faculty meetings, greater involvement, and less feeling of discouragement. One participant pointed out that although the group went off the suggested sequence in its problem-solving, the time was well spent. The group then went into a lengthy discussion on how open they had been. There was agreement that openness was more in evidence at the end than at the beginning but the openness was not as great as was found in the process groups. The principal observed that the group was "still learning how to be open." Some teachers felt that a lot of time was spent with little accomplishment to show for the time spent, suggesting that the size of the group was too unweildly. One teacher argued that the group has not looked at the real problem, how to teach children to be self directed.

When asked by a trainer how this episode differed from typical faculty meetings, the group responded that at faculty meetings there was much more silence and that the silence was used as a way of dodging the issues. There was agreement that although they didn't always stay on the subject--in fact, in workshop probably rather often pulled the others off the subject--the talk was preferable to the silence.

The focus was changed to another task, that of examining the expectations teachers have of the principal's role and the principal's views of the teachers; roles and how the roles interact. This task was introduced by asking the teachers to come up with a list of names of animals, literary figures, historical figures, etc. in terms of three foci: How we see him, How he sees us, and How we see us. The principal, in turn, was asked to prepare a similar set of lists with the teachers as referents. There was a good deal of laughter and joking in doing the task. Terms such as little boy, Don Quixote, Charlie Brown, "lost child," "indefinite," "humanist" were used to characterize the principal. Words such as too vague, too impartial, were also used. The teachers characterized themselves as grumblers, ungrateful, and Eeores, among others. The principal used such terms as mother, nurse, costume jewelry, to characterize the teachers.

In looking over the lists and explaining them, the principal pointed out that he did the negative things first and then circled back to put in the positive ones. The teachers did not agree with this. The principal thought it was harder to make up images about himself, the teachers thought it was easier to make up images about themselves. After more discussion, the participants were asked to deal again with the same referents. This time they were asked to complete the following two incomplete sentences: "What we like about him is...." and "I wish he would...." The teachers immediately found themselves describing a paradox, as they called it, in responding to the first sentence with the principal in mind. They said that he wants them to solve their own problems, but they grumble when he does this. They described the principal as easy to talk to, fair, open-minded, and considerate. They wished he would face reality more, be more realistic about teachers' limitations, show more leadership, be more aggressive, particularly toward the central office administration in getting supplies, and make expectations clear. One teacher observed that she wished "he would tell us we're on our own if we're on our own." There was disagreement among the teachers on whether the principal enjoyed the respect of the pupils. At the time this view was discussed the group of teachers seemed to talk all at once. The tape recording indicates that they went back to their discussion of the discipline issue reraising beliefs that had been discussed in the afternoon.

The principal also reported his perceptions of the teachers as a kind of paradox. Although he admired their patience, he wished the teachers would become more impatient about some issues and get steamed up enough to do something about some issues.

During the general discussion, one teacher suggested that possibly there was projection by some people who suggested that they wished the other person would change. The principal said he was annoyed about the idea that he was seen as not aggressive toward the central office. He said he might be being defensive and gave examples of aggressive behavior on his part. He accused the teachers as pleading that they don't have time when he asked for help on the budget.

The trainers suggested that the teachers "try to make it your own" when they tried to describe what other people meant. This suggestion was picked up and there were some clear and, we think, useful confrontations. It was found too that what people meant by lack of aggressiveness also meant lack of information of what became of conversations held between teachers and the principal. There was agreement that both parties had some responsibility to see that there was communication. The principal stated angrily that there are some things that teachers can solve themselves. A new teacher said she "didn't know you wanted us to change things." The principal suggested that we like on the basis of assumptions that had never been tested, saying that this notion had come out earlier in his small group. To us, this discussion seemed real and useful. We think the group felt the same way.

In addition to the observations made by the consultant and the data secured on the tape recorder, data were gained by means of pencil and paper instruments at the end of each day. At the end of the first day, participants were given two instruments. The first was a rating scale which permitted participants to report on their personal reactions on a 7-point scale. The items are noted below, with the numbers in parentheses indicating the mean of the responses. The higher numbers indicate greater involvement, etc.

1. personal involvement (5.8)

2. openness (6.3)

3. feeling that one's ideas were picked up and used (4.8)

4. how well the group worked on problems (5.1)
5. satisfaction with decisions and solutions (4.6)
6. optimism about influence of solutions and decisions upon future effectiveness (5.3)

The lower mean score for item 5 seems to support the observations made by the group as it analyzed its problem-solving work. The data also indicate that the trainers' greater emphasis upon human relations than upon work for the first day was reflected by the participants' feeling of greater openness. This instrument also contained items that called for written out responses. Items 7 and 8 and some responses are presented below.

7. Today I feel that the group accomplished:

Quite a bit (for 1 day) but there's still a long way to go.

A great deal in the a.m. Not a lot in the p.m.

More in the line of personal relationships.

A large increase in openness.

Greater understanding of each individual within the organization.

A unity it has never had.

Some eyeopening in respect to self-evaluation.

To some extent a useful breakdown of reserve.

8. My suggestions for the next steps in our work here are:

More problem solving (in smaller groups first and then all together).

More small group discussion. Determine more underlying causes of group's dissatisfaction. Are strong teachers fostering the general griping? Why?

I am getting tired of discussing discipline even though we haven't solved everything in this area. I would like to switch to a different topic.

Continue work on solving real problems with increased openness.

Discussing solutions to our diagnosed problem (hall discipline--openly opposing, supporting, questioning, as needed. More discussion of teacher weaknesses--and effectiveness as to role of principal.

m

Some more work on theory of discipline. We don't understand each other. This part of the group should work better. We face a stone wall in some of the others.

To begin problem solving on a basis of unity. We have really never had unified feelings on what problem is.

To return to the school with a spelled-out philosophy on discipline and a very specific program for carrying it out.

Two additional items were presented on an additional form. One item was a sentence-completion item, beginning with, "After this event focusing on the principal, I feel...." Responses were the following:

defensive in his behalf in some respects, but that some insights on this part were gained.

I know him better, and feel closer to him.

that we broke down some walls. Made ourselves much clearer.

upset.

what I felt before that he is a big man. The gift of freedom is not within the power of a small man who in the final analysis has to account for the whole school.

I better understand Larry.

that there must be greater understanding and empathy than seemed evident earlier.

we should focus on the faculty.

(tired)--a greater understanding of where I am at fault.

warmer, closer, and that some harmful misunderstanding has been cleared away.

that the degree of openness increased greatly and the constructiveness of the discussion was great.

The final item of the first day was a satisfaction rating like the one used in the micro-lab. This item was a 7-point scale, with higher ratings indicating greater satisfaction. The mean satisfaction rating was 5.7, considerably higher than the 3.7 of the micro-lab. Of course, the participants in the off-site lab included only volunteers and the evening ended on a high note. It is also interesting that many of the people who gave the day a 7 rating also wrote that the work with the principal was very helpful in increasing understanding. These data suggest that the goal of greater understanding of the roles of teachers and the principal was really worked on in a meaningful way.

The design for the second day that had been developed by the principal and the trainers was presented to the participants. This design included: (a) feedback of data, (b) process groups, (c) a faculty meeting on discipline, (d) plans to connect with those teachers not present and (e) plans for next steps with COPED.

The means and ranges of the numerical responses were fed back along with the written comments. A lengthy discussion ensued. One person pointed out that most significant to her was the fact that a new teacher had seen disorganization in the school rather than freedom. An observation was made by another teacher that more was accomplished in the morning in the small groups than in the afternoon and evening, adding that she for one failed to apply the morning's learnings later in the day. Another teacher said she was leery whether things would change after they went back to the school.

There was a good deal more discussion about the episode focusing on the principal with participants recalling the data and looking at the responses on newsprint still hanging on the walls. Some people reported they had felt inhibited throughout the evening. The principal said the task was difficult but the openness was valuable. Some teachers reported that they said things they had never felt free to say before. The participants discovered that they never asked what the principal meant by images such as nurse, mother, two-toed sloth, and costume jewelry. Some speculation followed, some with a good deal of laughter. The principal's philosophical indefiniteness was raised again but some teachers defended him, saying that he had sent out clear written statements and a book that defined his point of view. The principal said he felt teachers' own self image was low, and that they don't spend much time reading and talking about what they had read. This was followed by a general comment that the image we have of others comes from our self image. The teachers then said that the negative people on the faculty were stronger and influenced more. "It's a trap," one teacher observed. One teacher added that the children also have heard this negative attitude. It was important to take back a concrete program on discipline commented another teacher. The discipline problem, it was pointed out by one teacher, was an example of resistance to and the need for innovation in the school. This teacher speculated that the teachers could solve their discipline issues in five minutes if they could learn to be more open.

The process groups seemed to begin to work right away when it was time for them to begin. People talked about not being able to sleep the night before. They talked about how open they really were. There was a good deal of personal and active feedback. For example, when one teacher characterized herself as "not a group person," another teacher told her she came across as wanting to be a "group person," adding "Why don't you allow yourself to be loved?" There was work with trying to reach certain individuals in the groups and there was a tying-up of the personality characteristics seen in the groups with the teachers' teaching style and philosophies. In addition, there was work on innovativeness and how this fit into the COPED work in general.

The principal then became central for the rest of the day. He introduced continued problem solving in the process groups, giving directions to the groups to make specific suggestions to the entire group re: how to improve discipline. These suggestions were to be discussed with the view of making a report to the entire faculty at a soon-to-be-held faculty meeting. The process groups worked and returned with suggestions such as the following:

give an assembly to explain rules.

tape record hall noise with children to have them learn about the problem.

write and distribute rules.

rearrange the room assignments of classes to cause less traffic.

escort pupils into the courtyard.

teachers get to their rooms before 8:15.

use teacher aides and safety paroles more effectively.

continue work on a handbook that has been started.

the principal make a firm statement to the faculty.

The total group discussed the lists and process-commented on their work. It was suggested that the responsibility was being thrown back again to the principal. There was consensus that the rearranging of the rooms would be brought back to the total staff.

After a break for lunch, the total group continued to make process comments about the interactions of the two process groups, with some people saying they felt there had been antagonies shown. There was discussion on what the principal's role had been with some teachers saying they felt he seemed disorganized. He reported that he felt very much on the spot with the COPED people watching his performance along with the teachers. He talked about his feeling of tension but went on to say that the tension didn't come only from his feelings but from the total group situation. A teacher commented that the faculty meetings at home should feature sitting in a circle as was being done here. The principal returned to the theme of possible inter-group rivalry here by pointing out that the groups were sitting by process group and discussed whether a handout should be given to the teachers.

The discussion was then turned to the best way to conduct a meeting of the entire faculty. Some teachers argue that a handout with the decisions made before the meeting would be the best. Others suggested that it would be unwise to give a handout to people who had not been involved. It was suggested to the group that it might be useful to roleplay both views. Role playing situations were set up with the teachers playing both a teacher who had received a handout and one who had not. In the roleplay, the "backhome" teachers were both played as somewhat aggressive, one role player beginning, "Well, do you have everything straightened out?" and the other, "Did you solve all the school's problems?" The participants were able to see that they themselves might cast the other teachers into an aggressive role when they met back home. Another feature of the roleplaying was the fact that the teachers sin; the role playing justified with pious phrases the values of the workshop. The workshop seemed to drift into a conclusion as there was some discussion of the schedule of the follow-up meetings and little of the content. It was decided that an ad hoc planning committee make recommendations. This was done.

In general, we felt that four of the five goals set for this lab were worked on quite directly. Giving and receiving help on classroom problems was not. There was a good deal of openness, particularly with respect to the role of the principal. The problem solving seemed to give the faculty a sense of direction.

Data gained at the end of the second day showed the following means:

1. personal involvement (5.9)
2. openness (6.0)
3. feeling that one's ideas were picked up and used (5.0)
4. how well the group worked on problems (6.0)
5. satisfaction with decisions and solutions (6.0)
6. optimism about influence of solutions and decisions upon future effectiveness (6.0)

Mean scores on five of the items were higher than for the first day. Only for "openness" was there a slight decline. The group appeared, at this point, to feel better about its decision-making abilities as indicated by these data. The highest increase was in item 5: "satisfaction with decision and solutions."

This instrument also contained items that called for written out responses. Items 7 and 8 and some responses are presented below.

7. Today I feel that the group accomplished:

   effective communication which led to a positive attitude in the group.

   a set plan to present to the whole faculty.

what many felt was an original goal.

greatly improved problem solving.

a further feeling of unity.

"unity." Not conformity, but willingness to unite behind ideas that have been discussed and found to be feasible to try in practice.

a lot.

Larger group seemed to work better, less frustration.

8. My suggestions for the next steps in our work here are:

unification of total staff to try to gain the openness we have started as a result of the workshop.

to formulate more suggestions on discipline; to improve communication.

an active effort to keep up the personal involvement of this group and to try to involve the entire staff in this project.

follow up as planned.

to see if solutions have worked out and branch out to other problem areas.

to try to draw more members of the faculty into groups to work as we are working.

more problem solving but also reevaluating process.

continued work with COPED - Evaluation, understanding, and dealing with resistance, etc.

Two additional items were presented on an additional form. One item asked: "In a few words, please indicate your over-all feelings...." Responses were the following:

Wouldn't have thought it possible! Learned a great deal that I already know on a verbal level but not yet on other more significant levels. Follow up is very important.

I feel it is possible to develop better understanding of one another and to develop this into self-analysis and teaching-critique which can improve methods within the classroom.

Satisfied, but wanting to follow-up and complete the purpose.

Very productive. Exciting to find people talking after a year of silence.

I felt that we did accomplish some of the goals which we set out to accomplish such as working on a definite problem, working our misunderstanding with the principal, letting LBG know some of our gripes about him and his way of handling his role, and getting to know other faculty members. It still seems to me that we skirt problems. More concrete work should have been done.

I was very pleased that we did accomplish some solutions. I also got to know other faculty members better. I have become more open-minded in my feelings.

Optimistic, excited, a feeling of belonging and understanding, pro-COPED, finally something will be done to solve the problems.

Despite some very unpleasant personal feelings stemming from interrelating, I feel that the group has accomplished more communicative atmosphere which is conducive to, rather than resistant to, change.

We've greased the wheels!

Very hard work, some pain--all worth it!

I am more optimistic that this kind (COPED) of project can really work--I will be interested in the follow up when teachers begin to interact on the job--I think the whole idea of COPED works well when there is direct involvement --the faculty should be involved as soon as the administration is involved.

The questionnaire on over-all feelings of satisfaction also was repeated. The mean score was 6.4, higher than the 5.7 of the previous day.

III. FOLLOW-UP MEETINGS

The follow-up meetings did not eventuate as originally planned. The all-day workshop was canceled because of "lack of time" and the last of the four two-hour sessions was erased for the same reason. Thus, the follow-up meetings consisted of three two-hour after school meetings by the entire faculty. These meetings were planned by the Faculty Council (which had been established early in the school year) and the COPED staff members. The principal was unable to participate in two of the three planning meetings because of a conflict in the times previously set for COPED steering committee meetings. (The principal's absence from the two faculty council planning meetings was seen by the COPED staff members as a distinct minus but the end of the year was approaching and open dates were hard to find. Moreover, the steering committee meetings had already been set and the principal had a commitment to being there. An added difficulty in this work was the fact that members of the Faculty Council had been feuding all year long with intermittant violent flare-ups.)

The Faculty Council members reported at the planning meeting that at a May 1 faculty meeting there was much greater participation than there had been at faculty meetings in the past. Teachers were described as "very eager. They had things to say and said it."

The Faculty Council members also reported that the plan to change the rooms of some of the classes right away to reduce traffic and noise annoyance was voted down at a May 1 faculty meeting. They also reported that teachers who had attended the two-day workshop and liked the idea did not fight to support the idea.

The chairman of the Faculty Council, who had not attended the workshop, observed that those who had gone "learned about each other..." and "...had guts to say things..." He added, "We should all have gone... and we should do COPED-type things." On the other hand, a teacher who had not attended the workshop observed, "I hate this crawling on the couch and I hate being critical of people. We haven't the total faculty concerned in things that concern them."

The Faculty Council members and the COPED staff members considered a wide range of inter-personal and problem-solving needs and possibilities and decided upon two main events: a brief modified T-group session with groups composed of people from each of the process groups and teachers who had not attended the off-site workshop and a general session on ways to communicate better. The main objectives were seen as integrating the workshop and non-workshop faculty members and improving communication about principal and teacher work behavior.

The T-group session (40 min.) were introduced as a time to be open about your own feelings and how you saw others as well as a time to ask others for feedback on how they saw you. In the T-groups participants spoke of feeling "queasy" and "embarrassed" in the school setting. Some wondered whether it was correct to permit one's personal life to enter into their work. Some of the participants gave flattering feedback to others and some direct descriptive feedback on here and now perceptions of each other. There was talk about the authority of the principal and whether the Comstock School freedom was the best kind of freedom. Participants talked about a custodian whose overbearing behavior irritated them but they were not able to tell him so.

In the general session groups of teachers were asked to prepare on newsprint lists in response to the following: "We could communicate better at Comstock if we..." The groups worked and the following responses emerged:

tried (because it's important)

had more time

would all talk

could eat together

schedule

visited classrooms

had planned workshops

use communication forms

express in large groups what we express honestly in small groups

just have a chance

were more open

were more willing to share problems and seek solutions

listened (and digested what is told to us)

didn't expect things to be spelled out to us

asked when we didn't know

Next the groups focused on the principal and worked on, "We could communicate better at Comstock if he..." These responses were evoked:

made definite statements

not run hot and cold

would talk less

would visit classrooms more

would provide opportunities for us to engage in meaningful dialogue

would eat lunch with us

spent more time in the building

had an assistant

followed through in writing or other action

wouldn't ask individuals to "spread the work" but
would tell all

pay a few compliments or make constructive criticism

While the teachers worked, the principal prepared a list of comments on if they... His products were:

if they:

spoke to me more directly

spoke to each other more directly

read more widely

understood my problems better

were less defensive

attended more conferences

were more perceptive

if they:

were more definite

were better organized

made clear my "philosophy"

delegated more

understood their problems better

visited classrooms more often

gave more recognition

were more perceptive

A general discussion ensued after the outputs were viewed. The focus was on the principal. He said he felt he was "available" but some teachers said they felt he was not. He was told, "The more you come around the less you're a threat." The principal said he hoped for "more talk on ideas." There was some general talk about the values of openness.

May 22

This follow-up meeting was planned with the Faculty Council to focus on the goal of teachers helping each other on classroom problems. A meeting design was used where people worked in triads. One person was a help-giver, another a help-receiver, and a third served as consultant by observing the interaction and feeding back data on the work processes. Our own observations were that the participants were very involved and enjoyed the work. The participants talked of discipline, materials, and various methods.

In a general session there was discussion of the things that helped and the things that hindered the helping relations. Mentioned most were really listening and helping the help-receiver really define what the issue was.

The faculty then returned to the triads and continued.

By about 15 minutes away from quitting time the work was finished and there appeared to be a good feeling. This apparent good feeling seemed to relieve itself of the place when the teachers were asked for a discussion of the dates for two more subsequent sessions and a final full day of work. The discussion that ensued was not productive of dates. It was agreed to settle on dates some other time. The atmosphere seemed silent but aroused and to be marked by a diffidence.

June 5

Three COPED staff members met with the Faculty Council, including the principal. Most of the time was spent describing a faculty meeting that had been held, without COPED personnel, the Monday before, May 29. Having heard that the May 29 meeting had been a stormy one, the trainers had worked out in advance with another COPED consultant the plan to push the Faculty Council members to describe their own feelings rather than merely to report events. The Faculty Council members said they were upset. Some reported a "bad evening" after the meeting. Two members of the Faculty Council who agreed more COPED work was indicated noted that they could not agree on when this work should take place. Different Faculty Council members at times had different perceptions at what had really happened at the faculty meeting. People in the Faculty Council talked of how they had difficulty in communicating with each other. One teacher said it had been a miserable year and that she was disappointed that eleven teachers were agianst meeting on a Saturday.

In describing the whole group, the Faculty Council members said they saw a continuation of a big gap between the old timers and the younger teachers. They reported that many teachers had appointments for most week days and Saturdays through June. It was decided, then, to discontinue the COPED meetings.

It was decided that the faculty meeting on June 5 should begin specifically with a diagnosis of the functioning of the Faculty Council and then discuss ideas for communication improvement. The Faculty Council members opened by sharing their ideas on the work of the Council through the year. They talked of their internal problems. They said they were ineffective and unused by the faculty. They said they did not know their real functions. One member, the chairman, said, "It was a lot of work but I loved it." He saw the Faculty Council as having had the possibility of taking care of a lot of details. Another member saw the main purpose to set agenda for faculty meetings. Still another member thought the group was supposed to have been able to make certain decisions for the faculty. The principal saw the Council as an advisory body to him for some issues, a decision-making body for other issues, and generally a means of improving communication between him and teachers as well as among teachers.

The Faculty Council members agreed that they did not improve communication. "People never came to me with ideas," reported the chairman. When the rest of the faculty joined the discussion they agreed that the Faculty Council had not helped much. Some teachers suggested eliminating the Faculty Council. It was pointed out that when a few teachers wanted to study on innovative practice they informally called a meeting themselves--on a non-faculty meeting day.

There was talk about having so many faculty meetings. It was suggested that the principal set the agenda, consulting with teachers, and that he chair these meetings. The Faculty Council was described as a "passing of the buck" of responsibility by the principal. It was suggested by a COPED staff member that temporary ad hoc committees be set up by individual teachers and the principal to study specific innovative practices. It was suggested by a teacher that hallway conferences were inadequate ways to communicate with the principal and that written messages and formal sit-down conferences were preferable.

Data were gathered by asking people for the last time to indicate level of satisfaction with the work on the 7-point scale. The mean rating was 5.8 and the range was 4 to 7. Written comments were:

> We took too long to do what we did today. Solutions were good about faculty council problem, but again took too long.

I think you will have a group which will be able to handle issues, ideas, problems, etc. in a more satisfactory way than was possible this year.

100% better than last week! Encouraging. Slow, but productive. Realistic.

Slow but sure; something decided.

Went slow at first--seemed to be getting nowhere. But seemed to get on the road at last. I don't feel we're really ready to get rid of COPED.

Well done! As I've felt all along.

Today's meeting was very worthwhile.

Improved tremendously--More the way a faculty meeting should be.

Perhaps we could have acted more quickly to abolish the Faculty Council since the sentiment was fairly unanimous from the start. Success. Accomplished something. Still some won't talk.

Much better.

Think things will work better in future.

A step in the right direction. A bit too much discussion but this is probably due to last week's "discussion." I feel that we can solve problems or whatever by ourselves, if there is a definite statement of the problem.

Hoorah!

Can solve problems by ourselves. Direct communication now possible. Meetings drag out. Atmosphere being established.

IV. IMPLICATIONS

For the Comstock School faculty the events described here reveal a good deal of frustration and a lot of time spent on the program. But teachers reactions during the meetings seem to have progressed from a passivity at the beginning to a sharper speaking out later. The principal received much feedback that he should be more direct but continue to be supportive and interested in people.

The Faculty Council part of this account may be indicative of the shadowy way this time consuming structure stood in the way of the issues of power and authority in the school and actually inhibited rather than facilitated their work.

The data gained throughout the project indicate feelings of greater involvement, openness, and more effective problem solving. If this is true, it would seem to be desireable for further programs stressing interpersonal relations, communication, and problem solving. The faculty had only vaguely begun to work at anything resembling systematic decision making by the end of the school year. The meetings were filled with rather unsystematic work, unexpressed feelings, and not very usefully expressed feelings when they were expressed. At times certain participants seemed to mouth terminology we used but often these mouthings were without impact. But, there were a good many dedicated personnel who were afraid but willing to take risks and that would speak in favor of continued work.

With respect to training issues. First, the micro-lab seems to be a direct and open way to introduce training to a group. Trainers must, of course, gamble on people deciding not to be interested. Possibly self-protective devices permitted those to stay behind who, perhaps, were not able to cope at the time with the demands of a training program.

CASE STUDIES OF THE
MICHIGAN COPED SCHOOL
SYSTEMS

Project Director, Donald J. Barr

Documentarian:
Mrs. Polly Nelson
Mrs. Sally Feinberg
Mrs. Anne Glendon
Mrs. Rafiel Eziekiel

January, 1970

This section of the report includes descriptions of the five Michigan COPED school communities and the historical facts of each system. There are also case studies describing the COPED intervention in each system. The purpose of this section is to describe the differences that occurred in each system and how the ecological characteristics of each community and system contributed to these differences. Generalizations are made at the conclusion which indicate the findings from these case studies. Hopefully change projects which have an inside-outside collaboration model similar to COPED can utilize these case study findings to increase their awareness of the dynamics of this relationship.

Each school system that collaborated with The University of Michigan COPED project was selected to meet pre-project criteria. These criteria required an urban, suburban, small city, and a rural school system to compare their data with systems of similar size and characteristics in other COPED regions. One school system in each category was obtained. In addition Michigan had a control system where data were collected but no training intervention was made. The communities the University of Michigan COPED collaborated with were:

Andreos - Urban
Sarious - Suburban
Anderson - Small City
Manhattan - Rural
Port Entry - Control System

The basis of the COPED intervention strategy in the four school systems was to influence these schools to objectify and internalize their process of change rather than continuously needing to rely on external pressures and skills. There were three major interventions to promote the study of change in these school systems. They were: 1. The formation of a change-agent team within each system which would be responsible for maintaining, co-ordinating, and implementing the programs that were being proposed; 2. An in-service training program directed at classroom teachers and principals to increase their knowledge and skills in the problem-solving process and leadership skills in helping others in their school to learn this process; 3. An in-service training program for school personnel who had cross-building responsibilities, to increase their knowledge and skills in how to gather data from their system and how to utilize the results efficiently and effectively for continuous evaluation purposes.

The change-agent teams participated in a five-day workshop in August, 1965 for orientation and training as change agents. Participants for the two training programs were selected by the change-agent teams each using their own criteria and procedures. The problem-solving program was initiated in October and the action research program was started in January, 1966.

ANDREOS

Andreos is the central city in a tri-county metropolitan area (Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb counties) of southeastern Michigan which covers 1,965 square miles, contains 93 independent school districts, and accounts for over 50% of the pupils attending Michigan schools. The city of Andreos School System is one of the 43 school districts in Wayne County. An intermediate county school district functions as a link between the state and local districts; it is responsible for the recording of pupil attendance, school district organization and tax data, and reporting this information to the state. The intermediate district also provides consultative educational services to constituent school districts upon request.

The former Assistant Superintendent for school relations and special services, was named Superintendent in March, 1967, after serving as acting Superintendent since September, 1966. His predecessor had served as Superintendent since 1956. The legal responsibility for governance of the Andreos Public Schools is vested in a seven-member Board of Education, elected at large to staggered six-year terms of office. Andreos School Board members are elected on non-partisan ballots, as are all of the city's elected officials.

Before the days of suburban flight, the automotive assembly lines of Andreos attracted successive waves of European immigrants. In little more than one generation--between 1890 and 1940--Andreos grew from 25% to nearly 90% of its present population of 1,700,00. With the cessation of large scale immigration during World War I, Andreos' first major domestic importation of workers took place, spurred by war demands for increased production of automobiles and airplanes, and by the improvement of assembly line methods permitting greater use of unskilled labor. Most of the labor needed was supplied by Southern Whites and Negroes. The rural southern Negroes who have come to Andreos in the past 20 years, however, have not come as imported laborers. In large numbers, they have come to this and other northern cities seeking a place to live and to work because both had been lost to them in the South.

Reflecting what has happened in the city, Andreos' public schools lost 23,748 white pupils and gained 31,108 Negro pupils between 1961 and 1965. For the most part, those who moved out were the children of relatively stable, middle and upper income families of relatively strong educational backgrounds. For the most part, those who moved in and many of those who stayed were children of economically and educationally disadvantaged backgrounds.

As a result of the shrinking property tax base, the Andreos Public Schools lost a total of more than $29 million in local property tax revenues between 1959-60 and 1965-66. During this same period, every proposal to increase the school tax rate was turned down by Andreos voters; all increases in the support of public education csme from the state. Only four of the 43 districts in Wayne County had a school tax rate lower than Andreos' in 1965-66. Prospects for the future are not good.

These trends were set in the early days of urban renewal planning in Andreos. They have resulted in the hardening of racial and class lines in the city and its public schools. In renewal projects since the early 1950's, the insufficiency of efforts to find suitable housing for displaced slum dwellers has driven these people farther out from the downtown core and pushed the slums out with them. Public schools in the path of this spreading neighborhood blight have been inadequately prepared to compensate for the deprivations of the slum enviornment or to establish and maintain any meaningful educational contact with the constantly transient population of the ghettoes. The inequalities built into the society have spilled over into and threaten to engulf the ghetto schools. Nonetheless, school people have remained aloof both from the urban decision makers and from those who protest the decisions.

To the extent that there has been a racial mix in Andreos neighborhoods, it has been reflected in the public schools. Through a limited open enrollment policy, and by bussing students to relieve overcrowded conditions in inner city and transitional area schools, some additional desegregation of classrooms has been achieved. But, for the most part, segregated classrooms serve segregated communities.

The drop out rate for the Andreos schools is difficult to obtain. It varies from 2% in some high schools up to 45% in some of the inner city schools. City wide, the drop out rate varies according to the economic index. When jobs are available, the drop out rate increases; when students can't get jobs, they tend to stay in school. To combat this, the school system is sponsoring a variety of programs to allow students to work while attending classes, making it no great advantage to drop out. 42% of Andreos' graduates go on to college. High school principals are involved in an active program in Andreos to encourage all graduates to continue schooling. In a few high schools, college attendance by graduates exceeds 75%, but even in the most deprived areas in the inner city, the average is at least 7 to 8%. Approximately 10% of those attending college receive some kind of scholarship.

Teacher attrition rates for the Andreos schools is 9 to 10% each year. This figure is increasing because of the school system's attempt to reduce the teacher-pupil ratio in each classroom; this means the addition of about 300 new teachers each year, about 4% of the total faculty.

Curriculum changes are constantly taking place in the Andreos schools. The school system attempts to incorporate any new educational innovations that are taking place throughout the country in at least some of its schools. An indication of the extensiveness of research projects going on in the system is given in a report to the Superintendent in October, 1965. The report, titled "Projects and Studies Completed or Underway in the Andreos Public Schools in 1964-65," describes 223 research projects and studies. A preliminary breakdown of the projects shows the following: 122 are being carried out in cooperation with the staffs or students of

14 colleges and universities, 55 are for doctoral dissertations, 32 are being conducted by students below the doctoral level, 28 are being conducted by university staff members, 20 are being conducted independent of universities by individual teachers or administrators, 15 are being conducted by individuals or agencies outside the system, 14 are being conducted by school staffs working together within their schools, 61 are being conducted by divisions of the Andreos Public School System, and 18 are being partially or wholly supported by grants-in-aid to the school system. 68 of the projects are concerned with the improvement of instruction in subject matter fields.

Andreos and COPED

The Andreos School System was first approached by COPED in November, 1965. An exploratory letter and materials describing the projects' objectives were sent to the current Superintendent. It was desirable to have Andreos participate as part of the Michigan Regional COPED because the city was the largest urban community of its type in the area, and because it corresponded in size and description to the other major cities participating with other centers of the National COPED project. In February, 1966, two senior members of the university COPED staff met with the Superintendent and received confirmation of Andreos' willingness to participate actively in the project. It was felt by the Superintendent and other key people in the school administration that the Andreos Public Schools did not have a well developed change-management system and that participation in COPED might initiate movement in this direction. In June, 1966, one person was selected as coordinator of the COPED project in Andreos. His salary would be paid by the Andreos school system to serve in this capacity full time for the 1966-67 school year. During the summer of 1966, the Andreos COPED coordinator attended a five week National Training Laboratory in Bethel, Maine. A member from each of the Sarious and Anderson change-agent teams also attended training sessions in Bethel for part of the time and the contact between the three trainees facilitated cross-system working relationships among the three COPED teams during the following school year. Many times during that year, the Andreos COPED coordinator was asked to serve as a consultant for training or other change efforts being carried out in other COPED schools as a result of this Bethel contact.

As in all the participating COPED schools, the basis of the project's strategy in Andreos was to facilitate the development of an in-system structure for change. Rather than relying on external pressures and skills, the Andreos school system would be enabled to develop and internalize its own process of change through the acquisition if problem-solving and diagnostic skills by its own personnel. To promote this, the COPED project directed efforts at three major points of intervention the first year. They were: 1) the formation of a change-agent team which would be responsible for organizing, maintaining, and implementing the COPED programs being proposed, 2) an in-service training program directed primarily at building principals and classroom teachers for developing their interpersonal competencies and problem-solving skills which was called "microaction research", and 3) an in-service training program for people with primarily cross-building responsibilities, i.e., a reading supervisor, an assistant superintendent, head of counseling, etc., to provide them with diagnostic skills, which was called "microaction research."

In August, 1966, a five-day training and orientation workshop was held by the university COPED staff in Ann Arbor for the change-agent teams from all participating systems. At this time, only one other person, in addition to the coordinator, had been selected to work on the Andreos change-agent team. He was a Regional Superintendent for one of the nine administrative regions in the Andreos school system. COPED data collection and training interventions would eventually take place in schools located in three of the nine regions. It facilitated communication about COPED and the cooperation of potential participants to have the Superintendent of one of the regions actively involved in COPED.

Because of the size of the Andreos School System and certain problems incurred at the administrative level, COPED intervention efforts in Andreos encountered several problems not experienced in the other participating systems. The immensity of the Andreos school system prohibited any wide-spread communication about the project and its objectives. Change efforts would have to be limited to a few schools in some of the regions. Any one region was larger than any of the other school systems participating in Michigan COPED. Efforts to elicit interest and support for the project at a regional level would have required much more visibility of COPED personnel, both local and university staff, as well as greater support from the regional and central administrations than was possible at the time.

A major internal change that effected the relations between COPED and Andreos occurred at the close of the 1965-66 school year with the Superintendent retiring after ten years in that position. Because of his support, COPED had been approved for the Andreos system, and a salaried position at the central office level had been committed for the Andreos COPED coordinator. The Assistant Superintendent for school relations and special services became Acting Superintendent in September, 1966, and was named Superintendent in March, 1967. Changes at the administrative level began to take shape, culminating in the March, 1967 reorganization discussed earlier, that delegated greater power and autonomy to the nine administrative regions. The administrative changes ended what many had considered an authoritarian regime with decision making tightly controlled by the previous Superintendent. Staff members from the administrative level on down had felt under the previous administration that they were often coerced into facilitating decisions and maintaining projects handed down by the Superintendent regardless of their own priorities and commitments. With the evolvement of a new climate under the Acting Superintendent, there was a tendency to ignore or reject projects that had been endorsed by his predecessor in reaction to the control and manipulation it was felt he had exercised. COPED was one of the projects that suffered the consequences of this new administrative attitude. Since commitments had already been made to the university COPED, and a salaried position had been created for and was occupied by the local COPED coordinator, the project was to continue operation in the Andreos school system. However, instead of the enthusiastic support expected from the administration, indifference and lack of support were encountered. The Andreos COPED coordinator reported that several attempts on his part to meet with the Acting Superintendent and other key administrators in September and October to discuss the project had failed.

The result of this administrative indifference to COPED was that the project did not begin to operate in the Andreos School System to any significant degree in the fall of 1966, as was the case in the other COPED school systems. The change-agent team continued to be composed of the coordinator and one other person only.

Data collection in Andreos was held in April at about the same time the other COPED schools were preparing for their second, though considerably smaller data collection. Fifth and eleventh grade classrooms as well as a major portion of the adult staff were administered questionnaires in the six buildings that were participating in the training interventions of COPED. In addition, 5 elementary buildings and one high school that corresponded to the COPED schools, but had no involvement with the project, were selected to serve as control schools and provide the same data. The entire Andreos data collection, including the selection and training of mothers to administer questionnaires to the pupils, was handled by the Andreos COPED Coordinator. The decision to include control schools was his. The data collection was ably handled and went smoothly. The general attitude among the adult respondents in the COPED schools was that the data collection was just something to "put up with" in return for the training skills that were being provided staff members. In the COPED schools, the percentage of completed and returned questionnaires was very high.

COPED involvement in Andreos ended with the 1966-67 school year as continued funding for the project failed to occur. The impact of the project for such a limited period on the total system was inconsequential. Even at the regional level, the effect of COPED efforts was only experienced in those schools where training had occurred. Plans to expand intervention to include a larger portion of the total system were dropped once funding for COPED was discontinued.

SARIOUS

Sarious is a young, sprawling, suburban community of about 100,000 inhabitants living on the western edge of Andreos. It is bordered on two sides by industrial zones. Sarious has no downtown, but several miles of continuous commercial establishments along a through highway and shopping centers serve the community. A subdivision boom after the Second World War turned fields into living spaces, attracting middle income families whose occupations were in Andreos. Current construction on more new homes and roads is evidence that Sarious is still a rapidly expanding community. A majority of the school buildings are new, most of which seem to incorporate future innovations of teaching in their architecture - team teaching rooms, central library and hall exhibit areas, circular auditoriums with new stage and lighting possibilities. For the past decade, Sarious teachers have been voicing building needs, which have been taken into consideration in the newer plant designs.

The Sarious area, until 1925, was primarily agricultural when the first subdivision was built. The area grew steadily until the Depression when lack of work in Andreos held the population steady until the war. In 1940, Sarious' population was 8,714. The wartime boom in Andreos hastened the suburban growth in the area, and by 1950 Sarious' population had reached 17,534. Six separate school districts consolidated in 1944, a superintendent was engaged, and in 1947, the first high school was built. In 1960, the population was 67,000 with an estimated 125,000 projected for 1970. In 1960, only 31 percent of the residents were older than 35, and the average income for the city was $8,243.00.

The Sarious Chamber of Commerce 1963 survey described the labor force as: 95% employed; 18% Professional and Technical, 21% Owners and Managers, 15% Clerical and Sales, 10% Government, 16% Semi-skilled and 6% Unskilled. The largely middle class population of Sarious is highly mobile. Lower socioeconomic families are centralized on the southeast side near Inkster. The older school buildings are in this area and Sarious' Headstart summer programs were limited to this section. There are no Negroes and a small percentage of Jewish families in Sarious. One Negro adult respondent for the COPED data collection turned out to be on the custodial staff and not a resident.

The post-war industrial growth had declined in recent years but is now dramatically reversing. More clean industry such as bakeries, are moving into the area. The largest new industry is an Acme Ford Handling Concern with a tax evaluation greater than all new industrial concerns acquired in the last ten years, and will provide a new one million dollar tax support. The city is leasing building space to this concern and have room available for others. The population that these new industries attract will work in Sarious as well as live there.

The community as a whole is not politically active. This is accounted for by some as a function of the mobility of the population, where most residents have interests and occupations centered elsewhere. In the past, Sarious has generally elected Democrats to the State House of Representatives. However, in the last election, "far-rightest" Republican was sent to Lansing by the voters. Sarious' city government is organized in a strong Mayor-Seven Member City Council Plan, with a City Planner and active Planning Commission. There are 28 Protestant and four Roman Catholic churches, two public libraries, two theaters and the usual service organizations.

The seven member school board is elected for staggered three-year terms. School personnel feel that the "excellent" board is nonpartisan in action as in election, and of a liberal supportive nature; not much on "flexing it's muscles", due to a "top flight administrative staff in the school system." The superintendent is an older man but is hiring younger new people and supports an active internship program for administrators.

Sarious has had a history of success with bond issues for buildings. Although in the summer of 1966 the nine mill levy was defeated, during that fall, the five mill levy was approved. Total millage in use is over thirty mills. (Limit by state law is fifty mills.)

Research involvements in the system are extensive. Sarious, for years, has been a research field and teaching lab viewed with keen interest by university research teams. Although, in the past, local staff members felt they were often used as "guinea pigs for someone's doctoral thesis", at the time of the COPED intervention, there appeared to be real teacher interest in research that would affect them.

The Sarious School System's concern for change is summed up in the following statement from the Elementary Education Department News Letter, "The Coordinate", January, 1965: "True curriculum change must be a change in people, not merely changes on paper, people must have opportunities for new experiences, interaction and contemplation." Modern math, self-concept, new developments in Social Studies, individualization of instruction, team teaching, were areas of current concern in most of the elementary schools.

Sarious and COPED

In the Spring of 1965, Sarious was selected as the suburban school system for the Michigan COPED project. A change-agent team of administrators (70%) and teachers (30%) was organized to coordinate the project. One elementary principal on the change-agent team was selected to attend a National Training Laboratory at Bethel, Maine for a two-week session during the Summer of 1966. A member of the Andreos and Anderson teams were also sent. The summer training was to increase their skills as "inside" change consultants for the future work with COPED.

The entire Sarious change-agent team received training and orientation (along with the Manhattan, Anderson, and Andreos teams) during a 5-day workshop held at the University of Michigan in August, 1966.

In September, 1966, the Sarious change-agent team distributed a memo to their staff entitled "Council for Cooperative Research" which informed them of the approval of the COPED project by the Board of Education in May, 1966. It described the function of the change-agent team, and stated the major objectives of Sarious COPED to be as follows:

1. "To focus a significant portion of the total research effort on the training-learning process in each classroom."

2. "To serve as a linkage between Sarious teachers and administrators and the resources available at the University of Michigan and elsewhere throughout the metropolitan area."

3. "To use these resources both to appraise and to strengthen the change process in education as it is occurring in the Sarious schools."

The change-agent team held weekly meetings in Sarious attended by one member of the University COPED staff who acted as a university-school liason as well as a consultant. Conference calls were held twice a month between the University staff and the change-agent team coordinators from Sarious and the 3 other systems. In the spring, this contact between the university staff and the school system teams was expanded to include monthly meetings in Ann Arbor. Usually, two team members from each system attended. These meetings developed out of a request from the school teams for greater contact with and more direction from the university staff.

The change-agent team selected one member to act as historian for Sarious who would remain in telephone contact with the historian on the University staff, providing information on past and current school activities and attitudes, as well as reaction to COPED.

The change-agent team was responsible for organizing the COPED data collection and informing their staff about it. Area mothers, contacted through a local volunteer organization who often aided the schools in this way, administered the questionnaires to students. They were briefed about the project and given instructions at a 2-hour meeting organized by the change-agent team and aided by a member of the university team. Team members themselves administered the questionnaires to the adult staff. Despite some resistance, the data collection was successful in Sarious with a high percentage of completion and return. Where the change-agent team had visibility for the staff, reaction to the data collection was positive. Excellent pre-collection preparation on the part of the team as well as assurances of feedback helped pave the way. Knowledge about the planned training sessions also helped. Staff members were willing to participate in a research project that would benefit them. Resistance occurred mainly where the staff knew little or nothing about COPED. They were antagonistic to wasting their time on research questionnaires when no application of results appeared to ever be made in their schools. Many expressed the concern that no useful or comprehensive overview had been made of the projects already in existence in the Sarious schools. In addition, teachers felt they had no involvement in the innovations being used in their system and that COPED was just another example of an administration controlled project. Some of the students refused to fill out the questionnaire on the socio-economic status of their parents due to community sentiment, opposed, both past and present, to that kind of violation of their privacy. On the whole, however, the response to the data collection was good and this is largely attributed to the work of the change-agent team.

Following the data collection, the change-agent team focussed on the planning, organization and selection of participants for the training programs. The change-agent team worked with the University staff in designing the two types of training that took place. Once the training began, members of the Anderson, Sarious, and Manhattan change-agent teams participated as a steering committee with the University staff prior to each training session. The team members from each system who had been trainees at Bethel the previous summer also participated as co-trainers.

C-training was a "macroaction research" program designed for people who had primarily cross-building responsibilities who were interested in acquiring diagnostic skills and whose position in the system would enable those skills to be utilized at a cross-building or cross-system level. The C-team would develop skills in system-wide research and would eventually function in an advisory-supportive capacity toward the A and B-trainees and the change-agent team. Training sessions for A and C trainees were held during the 1966-67 school year.

Principals and teachers were informed that the A-training was a program designed to develop skills of action-research as it applied to their own situation in the classroom or building. Team members were selected by the teaching staff on the basis of the following criteria: informal status, influence potential, possibility for time committment and representative of a specific function. The team selected included five teachers, four principals, and two counselors. The A-training began with a two-day laboratory in Ann Arbor, which was followed by weekly sessions for the remainder of the school year. Trainees from Manhattan and Anderson participated with Sarious in the same sessions.

C-training participants were primarily volunteers who expressed a need or interest in acquiring diagnostic skills and who had some cross-system position in the school system where these skills could be applied. However, some participants were asked by their superiors to attend, which contributed to other frustrations that grew out of the training. The C-training team included two curriculum co-ordinators, one principal, one assistant principal, one high school research director and the central office Research Director (also a member of the change-agent team). The program included trainees from Manhattan, Anderson, Sarious, and Andreos. It was consucted over a five-month period which included two full-day and six half-day sessions. A-trainees designed and led one of the early sessions for the C-training, focusing on the development of problem-solving skills. This enabled A-trainees to apply skills they had been acquiring and it allowed for the two types of trainees from the same system to strengthen working and sharing ties back home.

In several other instances Sarious school system personnel, usually through members of the change-agent team, contacted the University staff to serve as consultants or recommended someone who would. Unfortunately expectations were high in Sarious that every time they made a request of this sort the University staff would respond. Lack of available time and other committments often made this impossible. The resultant frustration led to a breakdown of trust, especially between the change-agent team and the University staff.

It had been planned that an overall evaluation of the impact of the COPED interventions in Sarious would be carried out at the end of the second year; the Spring of 1968. However, there was no funding for the continuation of COPED during the following year, and further intervention and evaluation did not occur. Since Sarious is a large school system, the impact of COPED on the majority of the staff is difficult to assess without a large scale collection of data to measure the effects. Also, in terms of the size of the total school system population training interventions during the 1966-67 school year could only reach a small portion of the staff, even when taking into consideration the staff and students who had direct contact with the trainers in their building or classroom.

The change-agent team was composed of people highly committed to facilitating the process of change in their school system. They saw COPED as being related to other like-minded viable models of change already operating in their system. They enjoyed the support of a superintendent committed to continual change in the school system. They responded strongly to the University-school system collaborative process, although, at times, expressing concern over too much outside interference or manipulation. Up to the point and immediately following the data collection in the Fall of 1966, the Sarious change-agent team saw themselves as a very involved, task-oriented group who had control of the

COPED project in their system. Focussing on a specific goal, the data collection, facilitated team co-operation and cohesion. They organized the data collection in Sarious with a minimum of University help. The rapport between the University staff and the change-agent team was good. Once the data collection was over, a breakdown of relations occurred, both among members of the change-agent team and between them and the University staff. Much of this was attributed to the fact that the team no longer had a specific goal on which to focus. Local meetings bogged down. Team members expressed a need for more process work during their meetings.

The change-agent team found it difficult to adapt to the shift in focus. No longer "holding the reins" as they had been to this point, they found themselves more as co-ordinators, or a liason team, now that the COPED emphasis was on the training interventions. They felt that they, as a team, had no cohesion with ongoing events, even though they participated in the selection of participants for, and the design of, the A and C-training events. A sense of waiting for the University team to give them direction prevailed. The frustration and bitterness toward the University team's "lack of planning" of the change-agent team role continued to build during the year. In February, 1967, an all-day workshop was held in Ann Arbor for the change-agent teams from the four participating systems. The major focus was on re-defining the role of the change-agent teams and to plan for their operation for the rest of the year. It merely reaffirmed the role of the change-agent team as a co-ordinating group for the training interventions in the school system. In addition they would facilitate the feedback of data to the school system once it had been analyzed. The workshop, and subsequently the inclusion of change-agent team members in monthly University staff meetings in Ann Arbor helped to stem the tide of some of the frustration. However, a major drawback from the amelioration of much of the problem was the unavailability of data to work with.

The University staff shares a major portion of the responsibility for problems incurred by the lack of data for feedback. Initially, the only committments made were that Sarious would receive data when it was analyzed. It was not designated when this would occur, but plans included a large scale feedback program that would include data from all systems, for comparative purposes, without necessarily identifying the systems. In addition, once the C-trainees had acquired some diagnostic skills, it would be possible for them to identify certain problem areas in their system about which they would like any data that was pertinent from the data collection. The latter was facilitated to some extent, but the large scale feedback program, for which the change-agent team saw themselves as initiators and co-ordinators, did not occur during the 1966-67 year due to the time it took to process and analyze the data. Plans were finally made in the spring to provide data in the Fall of 1967.

The University COPED staff was never clear about the feedback; to whom, how, what data will be fed back. They were also never explicit about when data would be available, due in part to their own lack of knowledge about how long it would take to process. These things were never made clear to the change-agent teams.

On the other hand, the change-agent teams expected data to be available within a few weeks of the data collection while the University staff felt that late spring was a more realistic conjecture. The high expectation for immediate feedback by the change-agent team and the failure of the University team to communicate otherwise led to a real disintegration of trust between the two teams. In the February workshop, some details of the time and work involved in data processing were outlined for the change-agent teams, but still no clear answer was available about when feedback could take place. For the Sarious team this was just a continuation of what they saw as University staff evasiveness. They felt there was not alternative action in COPED for them if feedback was not available, and team self-respect and committment dissipated. Their interest had lagged after the data collection, and they saw the feedback as the one thing they could focus on completely. Greater openness and communication on the part of the University staff would have eliminated a lot of the problem.

C-training incurred more problems than A-training from the standpoint of the trainees. Many participants were told to attend by their superiors, although, ideally they should have volunteered. Most team members from Sarious were strangers within the system and only saw each other at training sessions. There was no back home reinforcement from one another. They were unclear from the beginning about the direction of the training, few had research skills, and they were uncertain about their own needs to acquire diagnostic skills. They were more task-oriented than A-trainees and were very resistant to process or sensitivity training activity. They feared back home reaction at being identified with the problems caused by the data collection since they had access to some of the data.

C-trainees learned to identify problems that had relevance for their job in the system and acquired skills for collecting data on the problem. One such problem or question identified by Sarious was "How can a principal get teachers to come to him for help in other ways than discipline?" When data was contained in the COPED package that had bearing on these problems identified, C-trainees provided requests to the University staff to have the data made available. C-training was a frustrating, confusing experience for the most part to the Sarious trainees.

Refunding did not occur for continuation of COPED training interventions in Sarious. Plans had been made to continue with the training for the 24 teachers selected by the A-trainees. The change-agent team did not continue to operate after the summer of 1967. Frustration over the lack of data for feedback of data was still high. Many felt that there were few visible results of the COPED effort in Sarious although whether the provision of feedback would have altered this is not clear.

Manhattan, village population 986, is located in south central Michigan, about seventy-five miles from Andreos and six miles from Anderson. It is surrounded by fifty lakes, including a recently developed 850-acre lake, Lake Columbia, for summer motels and cottages, as well as a substantial number of year-round homes. Summer tourism generates the economic base of Manhattan. There is very little agriculture in the area. Manhattan has one small plant which deals in plastic items. A larger automotive parts plant moved away in 1966 with no replacement. Most wage earners from the area have employment in nearby communities, primarily Anderson, where more work is available.

The central town of Manhattan is only several blocks long and typifies most eastern Midwest villages with a few small stores along a strip-park street. In the past five years the population of Manhattan has begun to change. The once stable, established community is experiencing a shift to a more rapidly expanding, mobile population. A larger percentage of the year-round population try lake living for a while, working nearby, and then move on. More job opportunities in the larger cities attract the younger people away from the area.

The voting history of Manhattan labels it Republican. The Anderson daily newspaper, Citizen Patriot, is read by most people. The local Manhattan newspaper, The Exponent, is the primary source of information about school activities for the community. It gives detailed coverage of school board meetings, and special projects, such as COPED's involvement in the Manhattan schools.

Eight members serve on the school board for staggered four-year terms. Elections are non-partisan, but the inclination is Republican. At the time of the COPED involvement, all board members resided in Manhattan; there was no rural representative.

In the 1966-67 school year, Manhattan students were housed in a complex of buildings located together. The high school was built in 1955 with a 1966 addition of two portable units and was used for grades 7-12. The elementary building was much older, with a 1964 addition. The upper elementary grades were using the older part of the building. The superintendent's office was in the high school. The enrollment in Manhattan for 1966-67 was: high school - 400; junior high - 350; elementary 400. There were forty-six teachers, one counselor, an elementary principal and a high school principal composing the total staff. All students and staff members were white. More than 50% of the students were from country and lake homes.

Changes in the Manhattan schools for 1966-67 included; the addition of four new courses, a departmentalized junior high, development of plans for an ungraded elementary, and partial flexible scheduling in the high school during two days of the week. Manhattan had no other research involvement besides COPED.

By a mid-July conference held with the superintendent, the elementary principal and the University COPED project director, confirmation of COPED involvement was assured with prior school board approval. Release time was promised for the change-agent team, then in the process of being selected, as well as the participants in the training sessions in the winter.

The Manhattan change-agent team included the two principals, the one counselor in the system, an elementary teacher and a high school science teacher. The high school teacher was selected to act as the local COPED co-ordinator. He was highly committed to the change process and was allowed half-time with school board approval, to work for COPED, in the Manhattan school system. One member of the team was selected to act as historian for Manhattan and report relevant information to the University staff historian. Following the August workshop, the local Manhattan newspaper, The Exponent, printed an article about COPED, discussing its goals, the future data collection and the role of the change-agent team. Referring to the August workshop is the following quote about the team:

> "they were trained in the art of looking objectively at a classroom situation to see what needs are there, and taught methods of meeting these needs. These five men will pass on the basic training to 20 of their fellow faculty and administration members to develop within the system self-evaluation, renewal, and improvement."

In the Fall, several supportive meetings were held by University staff members for the superintendent and change-agent team members. A University staff member, designated as liason between the school systems and the University COPED, began attending regular weekly meetings of the Manhattan change-agent team. In September, the change-agent team introduced COPED to their faculty at a total staff meeting. The superintendent also attended. The team distributed an inclusive "COPED Fact Sheet" describing COPED's Goals and plans for intervention in the Manhattan schools. Summed up in their words: "COPED is to encourage innovation, with evaluation of the process and sharing of the resulting information". Following a discussion period, the team distributed to the staff questionnaires to assess interest in COPED and the clarity of its purpose. Ranking the following two questions on a 10-Point scale, the faculty responded with a 7.3 to 8.1 range to "interest in involvement for school, student and system in COPED", but averaged a lower 5.6 ranking on "how clear you are on function and purpose of COPED". Highly committed to initiating change in the school system, the staff as a whole was enthusiastic about COPED, but they were often confused throughout the year about its purpose and possible usefulness for them.

Following this meeting, the change-agent team devised a questionnaire, which they administered to the high school teachers to measure their reaction to their current flexible scheduling. Only about half the teachers responded, but the team felt it was a good learning experience for themselves and the staff in relation to COPED.

In October, the change-agent team organized a one-half day COPED workshop for the entire staff, including the superintendent, which was held in the elementary building cafeteria. In preparation for the October workshop, the team prepared and administered another instrument on "How Change Process Functions in Manhattan", by assessing the ongoing innovations of departmentalization of the fifth and sixth grades, Harper Rowe reading method in the elementary school, flexible scheduling and discontinued bells in the high school. The questions included: 1) "To what extent were you involved in planning for this change?"; 2) "To what extent is this change being continually evaluated?"; and 3) "To what extent did you feel free to voice your feelings about the change?".

Four University COPED staff members attended the meeting, which had been made possible by release time for the Manhattan staff. The meeting opened with a presentation of the summary of the questionnaire prepared by the change-agent team. The team then divided the staff into five smaller groups with a University or Manhattan COPED team member in each group. Following a discussion of the implications of the questionnaires summaries, each group was to come up with three definite improvements for implementing change in their system. Improvements suggested were more time for total staff to meet and exchange ideas, better communications at all levels, teacher involvement in making recommendations, and teacher-administration co-operation and evaluation. The meeting closed with a more formal introduction of the University staff members to all participants who answered questions about COPED, the upcoming data collection, and the training interventions. A post-meeting evaluation showed a positive reaction to the workshop, a high level of interest in COPED, and enthusiastic support of University staff participation. The workshop provided an excellent means of involving the entire staff in a COPED initiated project. The size of the school system made it impossible for any staff member to be unacquainted with COPED, but the successfully organized workshop encouraged support and participation by the faculty. Manhattan was the only participating system in Michigan where the University staff and local change-agent team were visible to the entire staff.

The data collection was held in November of 1966 with a smaller one held in the Spring. The entire fifth and eleventh grade population (a total of four classrooms) and about 75% of the adult staff received questionnaires. Some of the teachers objected to the length of the questionnaires, but no one resisted on the basis of having no knowledge of COPED or the ultimate use of the data. The superintendent's wife and another mother volunteered to administer the questionnaires to the students. They were given brief instructions by a University staff member. The data collection encountered no problems in Manhattan.

After the initial plunge, the development of questionnaires, the intensive planning of the October workshop, and organizing of the data collection, the Manhattan change-agent team began to experience a let down. The COPED focus had shifted to emphasis on the training programs and the change-agent team was having difficulty adjusting. They had seen themselves from the team's inception as an action-initiating team. Now the University staff had become the prime movers for the project in regard to the training programs and the change-agent team was needed to assume a more co-ordinating role. The difficulty in adjusting to this new phase of COPED was reflected in a breakdown of relationships among the team members. They asked their University staff liason to help them work on process and interpersonal problem-solving in their team meetings. Team members asked the co-ordinator to share the agenda in advance so that they would know what was going on, he in turn, expressed frustration about the lack of attention to presented items and annoyance at the "side-jokes". The members felt that as a team they were viewed by the faculty as aligned with the status-quo of the administration during this time of overriding concern with contract renewal for teachers. They decided to hold open meetings in the school buildings. The team felt it would give the staff a boost "just to hear us criticize each other without getting angry, but only to work together better".

Following the data collection, the change-agent team focussed on the planning, organization and selection of participants for the training programs. The change-agent team worked with the University staff in designing the two types of training that took place. Once the training began, members of the Anderson, Sarious, and Manhattan change-agent teams participated as a steering committee with the University staff prior to each training session. The team members from each system who had been trainees at Bethel the previous summer also participated as co-trainers.

Training was to focus initially on the development of working relationships within each school system, and in relation to each of the University teams. This was called "microaction research" and was directed at classroom teachers and principals. The training program was designed to increase skills in problem solving and interpersonal competency. The participants in this training program would not only be able to improve problem solving and interpersonal relations to their own classroom or building setting, but would also be able to train others to acquire the same skills. This type of training was termed A-training by participants and trainers in order to easily distinguish it from the other training session.

Early in January, the A-trainees, who had been selected by their colleagues, participated in the two-day opening session of the training program in Ann Arbor, along with trainees from Sarious and Anderson. The Manhattan trainee team consisted of four teachers and a counselor. One teacher and the counselor were also members of the change-agent team. The training sessions continued weekly until spring. The Manhattan A-trainees were enthusiastic about the training which was designed to improve their interpersonal skills and problem-solving techniques. Selecting a problem to work through that had relevance for them in their own school setting, facilitated understanding and interest on the part of the trainees.

Manhattan A-trainees, although highly supportive of the training sessions and the sharing with other systems, expressed uneasiness in participating with trainees from the larger systems. They felt, as did the change-agent team and later the C-trainees, that as a small system they were often merely tolerated, that they had nothing significant to contribute in the total collaborative process, and that they were inadequately equipped to offer anything in terms of the higher degrees and wider experience of most people from the other systems. Because Manhattan did not begin active participation in COPED until late in the summer of 1966, they were unable to send anyone to the National Training Laboratory in Bethel, Maine as the other systems had done. Although they were promised this opportunity for the following summer, they still in a sense felt left out. Team members often found it galling that a COPED participant, from another system who had attended the Bethel lab., found it necessary to bring it up in every conversation they had with him.

From the outset, the Manhattan C-trainees were confused about why they were selected, what skills they were to acquire, how they would utilize them in their system and what their relationship was to participants from the other systems. Unlike the other trainees they had no specific cross-system responsibility, and they were the only team composed entirely of teachers. Also, the Cement City teachers were not as familiar with COPED as Manhattan teachers might have been and this added to the problem. However, it was felt that involving Cement City people at this time would facilitate their active collaboration when Cement City would be completely integrated into the larger Manhattan school district.

Manhattan C-trainees selected the recent annexation as a focus for the development of their research skills. Feeling that there was little relevant material in the data available from the fall collection in Manhattan, they asked the University staff to help them devise a questionnaire that would speak to problems incurred by the annexation. They administered the questionnaire to the Manhattan and Cement City faculty members. C-training participants from Sarious offered to consult with Manhattan trainees on the annexation, having experienced a similar situation in the past. This collaborative process enabled Manhattan to feel more at ease with the other participants. Focusing on a situation that had immediate significance for them and actively seeking data on the problems was an important step in eliciting the support, confidence, and involvement of the Manhattan participants in C-training. By the end of the school year, the C-trainees were beginning to be regarded, by themselves as well as the change-agent team and others in the school system, as a resource for identifying problem areas in the system and initiating questionnaire administration in these areas. They were looking forward to actively fulfilling this role in the following school year.

In February, the change-agent team joined the other teams from Sarious, Anderson, Andreos and the University team at Ann Arbor for a one-day "refresher" workshop. Each co-ordinator presented a brief summary of system COPED activities and concerns. Manhattan's particular concern was a need to work out A and C-trainee roles and how to get from this to an overall effort in their system. An overview of the A-training program was presented, and a chart presented of the various phases of COPED activities and how they were interrelated. Each system explored the question "How can our COPED team be more effective?" The Manhattan team felt lack of openness between team members was an issue they could work on. The University team tried to deal with some of the frustrations developing over the lack of available data from the fall data collection. Change-agent team members expressed a desire for a research council comprised of representatives from the school systems to work with the University staff on the planning of future developments. To initiate closer collaboration between school systems and the University teams, at least two team members from each system began to attend monthly staff meetings in Ann Arbor. At the time of summaries at the end of the workshop, the Manhattan team co-ordinator reported that as a team they now recognized much of their frustration was from lack of productivity related somewhat to data expectation and were ready to settle down by way of process work to redefine their goals.

The Manhattan change-agent team after meeting jointly with A and C-teams several times to share experiences, clarify roles and find ways of dissemination, planned a presentation of COPED "Planned Change" to be given at a Cement City faculty meeting. On March 22, the three teams, sitting in a semi-circle facing the faculty of about twenty-five, accomplished this, using all available resources, including printed hand-outs, and slide projections to explain national COPED, Michigan regional COPED, and to illustrate Manhattan involvement. Included were samples of the A-team classroom data collections. Most effective was an informal presentation of these facts highlighted by the personal experience of team members. This discussion was frank and exposed their initial frustrations and doubts, but added the current satisfaction of their learning experiences. They explained that their initial work had pointed out the need for a research and Development Program in their system. The Cement City staff asked a few questions and following the workshop, four teachers approached the team expressing interest in involvement next fall.

For the remaining school year, the three Manhattan teams, A, C, and change-agent, continued to hold weekly staff meetings together. Team members felt that they could more effectively work on problems and projects working as one team, with change-agent team members serving in a co-ordinating capacity. Together they planned a presentation and training workshop, with a follow-up session, for the A-trainees to work with the entire school staff on problem-solving and interpersonal skills. However, they could not schedule it so late in the spring due to end of the school year pressures on the staff. Plans to continue in the fall were tentatively set up.

Late in the spring, the Manhattan COPED historian reported a feeling verbalized by more than a few of the Manhattan staff, that there was nothing visible about COPED - "all those questionnaires and nothing we can see!" He also felt that both their team and the University team had fastened greater expectations of more direct involvement of the University staff than became a reality; an expectation given fuel by the extensive University staff involvement in the fall, especially at the October workshop. He pointed out a need for more explicit COPED goals not only in Manhattan but at the University. To Quote, "This must be confronted before we (A and C, and change-agent teams) can work together on a joint plan for the future." Some expectation of summer consultation with special reference to the C teams annexation study developed.

In the fall of 1967, the historian reported that in spite of overcrowded school conditions the morale was "real good". Two new school board members had been elected and the new high school building program approved. The COPED team had not reactivated as a team before school opened, and had no definite plans as yet. Several staff members had expressed a new awareness of their students and classroom interaction attributed to their COPED training.

COPED not being refunded, most planned projects for the 1967-68 year did not occur.

ANDERSON

Anderson is a small, old, industrial city surrounded by rich farming land in south, central Michigan. Approximately seventy-three miles from Andreos, it is at the center of Jackson County, which, comprised of nineteen townships and the city of Anderson, encompasses an area of 707 square miles. Anderson itself is about ten-square miles.

Anderson's initial primary industry was paper when southern Michigan still had an extensive lumber industry. At the turn of the century, the emphasis switched to automobile production. Such cars as the Huppmobile, Carter Car, Jackson, Buick, and others were originally manufactured in Anderson. Major industries today are automotive and airplane parts, air conditioning equipment, textiles, metal stamping tools, and electronic equipment.

Anderson's population has remained fairly steady in the past two decades although population of the county has increased more rapidly. Recently the city's population has begun to grow. Census figures are shown below:

POPULATION	CITY	COUNTY
1950	51,088	107,925
1960	50,720	131,994
1967	51,400	137,400

The Anderson Chamber of Commerce brochure for 1967 lists the number of homeowners in the city at 16,300 among 30,814 households. The total labor force is 50,000, which suggests that a considerable number of workers live outside the city. 90.7% of the population is white.

Anderson's government is a non-partisan commission-manager system. Voting records in state and national elections label Anderson a strong Republican community. The city has 53-Protestant and six-Catholic churches, one synagogue and one Eastern Orthodox church. The community is considered by its school personnel, to have an excellent cultural climate, with the usual drama, art, music and library organizations. Albion College, Western Michigan and Michigan State University are in the area and provide several student teachers to the school system each year.

The equalized valuation of the Anderson Union school district for 1966-67 was $225,415,069.00 or $16,029 of taxable valuation behind each student. The assessed valuation of the district for that period was $154,405,315.00. Anderson spends $572.00 per pupil with an ADA of $13,255. $200.00 of this is provided by the state, the remaining derived from the local tax base.

The Union school district of Anderson has a population of about 75,000. Comparison with the actual population of the city of Anderson (51,400) shows that one-third of the area served by the school district is outside the city. School board members number nine because of a special state act. Most school districts have eight board members. One member has been on the board for twelve years; the others are relatively new. The school system has twenty-one elementary, three junior high and two senior high buildings. In addition to the public schools, there are ten parochial schools, and a two-year community college. The Union school district attendance is about 13,000.

Anderson has an excellent school plant. The newer of the two high schools (enrollment 2,000, grades 10-12) began construction in the spring of 1967 on a $4,000,000 modernization and addition program. Most of the junior high schools were overcrowded, allevaited somewhat by the completion of a new junior high school in January, 1967. Anderson was in the process of revising the "middle school" idea in 1966-67, to enable the junior high schools to serve only the seventh and eighth grade populations and have the high schools house grades 9-12. Four elementary schools were new in 1960 with many additions to nine others. The school system attempts to keep elementary class sizes at about twenty students, with 22-23 students per high school class. School building has been keeping up with child population as far as possible with several bussing adjustments made. In bussing students from at least two of the elementary school districts, the Anderson school system is also considering racial balance. Of the twenty-one elementary schools in Anderson, eight have 500 or more students, five have at least 400, and the rest are smaller. One school has 600 students with only 17 teachers. In the past bussing was provided for all students living more than a mile from their schools, but since the 1967 mileage loss, bussing is only possible where adjustment for school size is being made.

Of the adult population being served by the Union school district, 41-45% have graduated from high school. 68% of Anderson's graduates go on to some kind of college, including Anderson Junior College; 3% attend technical schools; 8% receive some kind of scholarship. Of the students who take the National Merit Scholarship exam, 39% are over the 75 percentile, 20% between the 50 and 75 percentile. The drop-out rate is about 5% for the newer high school, closer to 10% for the older one. Teacher attrition rates are from 10-12%. The salary scale in Anderson is better than other parts of the state.

Anderson was selected as an actively participating system, representative of a small urban community. Following school board approval and assurance of release time for the change agent and trainee teams, selection of the change-agent team was initiated, and one person selected to attend a two-week National Training Laboratory in Bethel, Maine during the summer of 1966.

The change-agent team was composed of two administrators, one of whom became the team co-ordinator, one high school and two elementary principals, two teachers, a librarian and a psychologist. The change-agent team held weekly meetings in Anderson attended by one member of the University COPED staff who acted as university-school liason as well as a consultant. Conference calls were held twice a month between the University staff and the change-agent team co-ordinators from Anderson and the three other systems. In the spring, this contact between the University staff and the school system teams was expanded to include monthly meetings in Ann Arbor. Usually two team members from each system attended. These meetings developed out of a request from the school teams for greater contact with and more direction from the University staff.

The change-agent team selected one faculty member as historian for Anderson who would remain in telephone contact with the historian on the University staff, providing information on past and current school activities and attitudes, as well as reaction to COPED.

In October, 1966, the change-agent team invited members of the University staff to attend a regularly scheduled executive meeting for all Anderson principals and central office administrators. The purpose of attending this meeting was to provide Anderson administrators with the visibility of the Anderson and University COPED teams, to present goals and planned interventions of the project and prepare them for the upcoming fall data collection. The presentation was fruitful; most people expressed interest in the project and responded to the presence of both teams. Many felt, however, that the major hypotheses and procedures of COPED were not clear. It was helpful to the local team to have the University staff present. The Anderson team had put itself out on the limb to some extent in being supportive of COPED and its goals. This opportunity to demonstrate the collaborativeness of the relationship between the University and local teams improved administrative attitudes considerably.

The data collection was held at the end of November. The change-agent team prepared a comprehensive fact sheet about COPED and a data collection schedule which was circulated to all buildings. Area mothers contacted through several local volunteer organizations administered questionnaires to students. The change-agent team co-ordinator conducted a meeting for the mothers, introducing COPED and explaining some of its goals and objectives. A University staff member present provided training and instruction for questionnaire administration. The student data collection was carried out without difficulty. The change-agent team organized the adult data collection. It was, at best, rocky. Adults objected to using their own time to complete the questionnaires; they found them lengthy and felt in general it was a waste of time despite assurances of feedback. The greatest resistance centered around the problem of anonymity. Adults were requested to seal their completed questionnaires in envelopes that were provided and either turn them in to their principal's office as a collection point or take them directly to the co-ordinator of the change-agent team who was in the central office. Because their names were on the questionnaires many felt that sealed envelopes were no deterrent, that someone at an administrative level could read the questionnaires before they were sent to Ann Arbor and use their responses against them. Many obtained the University COPED address and mailed their questionnaires directly. In one high school, whose total staff was to be sampled, only one-third of the staff returned the questionnaires. The rest, including the principal, took them home, threw them away or just disregarded them. Some people were not even convinced that once the questionnaires were in Ann Arbor that their responses or names would remain confidential.

In January, the Anderson School Reporter, a small monthly newsletter published by the school system and circulated to staff, parents and others in the community, carried a report about COPED. It explained that through COPED involvement the Anderson school staff would gain understanding in diagnosing their own needs for change and improvement. The article discussed the COPED plans for training and, ironically, the planned data collection which had already taken place prior to the appearance of the article. A picture of the Anderson change-agent team was included. The question was raised that if this article had appeared much sooner in the school year, that a large part of the resistance to COPED would have been reduced, especially as it related to the data collection.

In January, the change-agent team organized the selection of the trainees for the A-training program. Participants were nominated by their peers on the basis of their interest, and the amount of informal influence they held with their colleagues. Attention was paid to selecting participants from different buildings at the elementary and secondary levels. Final selection of the trainees was by the change-agent team, based on the peer nominations. The A-team chosen consisted of two secondary teachers, three elementary teachers, (one of whom was a member of the change-agent team) a counselor, and a research and development administrator from the central office.

C-trainees unlike the A-teams were selected solely by the members of the change-agent team. Participants were chosen who had cross-building responsibilities and showed some interest in research. The C-team was composed of: a high school assistant principal, two elementary teachers (one was a resource teacher), the co-ordinator of co-operative training in the high schools, a school psychologist and the Director of Instruction from the central office. The latter two participants were also members of the change-agent team. From the outset of training, the Anderson participants expressed confusion over the training goals and procedures, and bewilderment over their own involvement. Part of this may have been due to the unstructured nature of the total training program. Similar confusion was felt by Sarious, Manhattan, and Andreos trainees. Anderson participants, for the most part, came to the C-training with little prior knowledge of COPED. Many of them had not been touched by the data collection. They felt the University staff assumed that they knew more about COPED than was the case and that, consequently, no time was spent at the beginning clarifying the COPED project goals and how C-training was related to them. Those participants who were not on the change-agent teams, were not clear about the functions of the A-training or change-agent teams and how the C-training team would work with them. They expressed a desire for sharing meetings with other teams in order to learn more about the total design of the project. Starting training sessions later than the A-teams, not being nominated by their peers as the A-teams were, not having what they felt were needed goals and directions set up for them by the University staff, all contributed to the ambiguity of the role for the C-trainees. In general, they were not as highly motivated as the A-team and this was reflected in inconsistent attendance at the Ann Arbor sessions. Many felt too spread out in the system from the other C-team members to focus on one problem that would have equal importance for all of them. Once a problem was selected for diagnostic work by the Anderson team, they felt the data from the fall data collection was meaningless in terms of their needs. They felt that the training sessions were too short and not held often enough to be helpful to them.

Members of the University staff began to attend C-team meetings in Anderson held in the interim weeks when there was no training session in Ann Arbor. These meetings, plus the general evolution of a clear design during the Ann Arbor training sessions, helped reduce many of the frustrations the C-trainees were experiencing.

In February, 1967, the Anderson Superintendent met with members of the change-agent team expressing concern about the position of COPED in the Anderson school system. He felt that the project was not well enough understood by the majority of the staff and, as a result, people were becoming increasingly suspicious about its usefulness. The Superintendent, who was put in the positions of explaining or defending COPED, thought the change-agent team needed to be more responsible in disseminating information about goals and activities, especially the ongoing training interventions, as they had begun to do in the fall. Visibility of the COPED staff was limited to a few specific levels or task groups within the system. COPED had been introduced to central office and building administrators during a regularly scheduled executive meeting in October. This contact was mentioned earlier.

The Curriculum Co-ordinating Council meetings, held monthly, were attended by one member of the University COPED staff. During the October meeting, the COPED change-agent team co-ordinator, who was also a Curriculum Co-ordinator and a member of the Council, introduced COPED to other members of the Council. The Curriculum Co-ordinating Council was composed of twenty-seven members including the Superintendent, the two Curriculum Co-ordinators and the Director of Instruction, plus teachers, guidance personnel and other administrators. Four members of the Council were also members of the Anderson COPED change-agent team. The major concern of the Council was the implementation of the change in the Anderson school systems, a concern shared by the COPED project. Recently, the Administrative Structure Committee had invited a consultant from the University of Michigan Bureau of School Services to evaluate the effectiveness of certain organizational structures within the Anderson school system. A primary focus of this study was the functioning of the two Curriculum Co-ordinators and the corresponding Council. It was felt by the administration in Anderson that the whole curriculum co-ordinating structure needed to be reorganized. From an original eight to ten Curriculum Co-ordinators, there were now only two. People who were attracted to the role of co-ordinator were often upwardly mobile, staying with the school system only a short while and then moving on. As this continued to occur, people were not replaced, which left the entire curriculum co-ordinating structure somewhat atrophied in its effectiveness. Teachers were apathetic about implementing change through normal organizational channels, as it got them nowhere. The introduction of COPED to the Curriculum Co-ordinating Council, many of whose members were already familiar with the project, and the attendance at the monthly meetings by a University COPED staff member, were aimed more at learning and sharing information on the process of change through an already existing structure in the system, than concerned with disseminating information about COPED to the Anderson staff.

In January, COPED team members sensed a growing resistance on the part of the school Board, to time and energy committed to a project Board members were not completely informed about. COPED change-agent team members planned a presentation for the Board, discussing past activities and future plans, with special emphasis on the training activities. In general, the main body of staff members knew very little about COPED as it was operating in the Anderson school system. Contact was limited to a pre-data collection information sheet circulated to all buildings, the data collection itself, and the article about COPED in the school newsletter. Responding to the Superintendent's request for more extensive information dissemination, the change-agent team discussed several ways to facilitate this. They decided the most effective method of communication about COPED would be a demonstration that would utilize the skills of the A and C-trainees in some change efforts within the system, then feeding back results to the total staff.

In March and April, 1967, the change-agent team met with the A and C-teams to plan for an in-service training program for teachers and administrators and to begin presentation of COPED to a disadvantaged elementary school with the purpose of organizing a school-community committee. The actual training in this school was done by the A-trainees, with the consultant help from the University staff. Training meetings were held with the staff of this school through May and June of 1967. Participants felt there was good rapport between the COPED A-trainees and the school staff. Post training evaluation questions showed the school staff were enthusiastic about the intervention and were anticipating a continuation of the effort the following year.

In June, a feedback session, planned at the joint meetings of the change agent, A and C-teams, was conducted for an administrative group concerned with curriculum. C-trainees administered questionnaires designed to determine the values of people at various levels in the school system. The results of these questions, were presented to the administrators, which stimulated a discussion around the divergence of values existent at different levels within the system. Then the change-agent team conducted a role play around the issue of values. Administrators, at the close of the meeting, were asked to take the feedback material back to their buildings and hold similar sessions with their teachers exploring the same or other issues. The response to the meeting was good. Many felt it was too late in the year to do any work with their staff, but some expressed a desire to begin working with staff members in this manner in the fall.

Contrary to the experience of change-agent team members in at least two of the other participating systems in COPED, the Anderson team did not find it as much of a handicap that data was not available for feedback to the system, in terms of the cohesive functioning of the team. They also, did not experience the same feeling of disorganization, once the data collection was completed and the COPED emphasis shifted to the training interventions, that the other teams expressed. Part of this was attributed to the fact that the Anderson team had, by the middle of the fall, pretty thoroughly worked through their problems of role identity and group co-operation. From the time of their selection, late in the spring of the previous school year, members of the team, concerned about why they had been elected and what was expected of them, had worked together as a team to explore the clarification of their roles. During the last day of August, 1966, workshop for change-agent teams, the Anderson team asked their Superintendent to join them for a half-day session to deal with this issue. Though many felt some questions were unanswered, the issue remained open and the team continued to work on it. Consequently, the Anderson change-agent team was not so task-oriented, that once COPED activity slowed for a period following the data collection, did they find the team faltering without an immediate issue on which to focus.

Secondly, the Anderson change-agent team appeared to be less interested in the availability of data for feedback during the current year, than they were in working with the training interventions. They were concerned that the feedback committment to their staff was fulfilled, but they were more realistic than some of the other teams about the time it would take to have data available. As a team they were more concerned about establishing COPED as a change-agent training-intervention project in their system the first year. One team member stated that he would have preferred that the data collection could have waited for another year. In terms of the resistance encountered among the staff against the fall data collection, he felt the project would have received greater support if the data collection could have been postponed. During the February "refresher" workshop held in Ann Arbor for all four change-agent teams, the Anderson team, as did the other, expressed concern about no visible data to provide their staff. In general, however, they were far less dependent on available data than some of the other teams were.

Finally, in addition to working closely with the A and C-trainees in Anderson and planning interventions with these teams in the Anderson schools, the major focus of the change-agent team was on the development of a Title III proposal for a project called S.P.E.C.

The Strategy for Planned Educational Change (S.P.E.C.) was a three-year project designed to facilitate more effective educational teaching and learning through an in-service program focussing on the development of interpersonal skills, problem-solving techniques and an understanding of group dynamics. The $420,000 project was approved for a Title III grant in the spring of 1967. Members of the University COPED staff aided Anderson personnel, including many members of the Anderson change-agent team, in the development of the proposal. S.P.E.C. was not a direct product of the COPED intervention in the Anderson schools; but in many ways, through the involvement of COPED people, and influence of ideas, the project reflected the COPED design. The S.P.E.C. design included nine training labs (eleven days each) to be held over a three-year period. Each lab would consist of five initial days away from Anderson, one day every other week for ten weeks in Anderson, and a final day away. Approximately seventy-seven people would participate in each of the nine labs. Participants included teachers, administrators, students, parents, and other community people. The precedent for this had been established in the summer of 1966 with the participation of ninty-six people in the sensitivity training lab at Camp Kett in Michigan discussed earlier. The S.P.E.C. project was associated with the State of Michigan Training Laboratories with trainers from both the University of Michigan and Michigan State University. The first lab was held in August, 1967.

In a sense, Anderson was the one school system in Michigan COPED that continued some element of COPED involvement for the following school year, despite the lack of funding. One University COPED staff member served as a trainer in the S.P.E.C. labs held that year. Anderson change-agent and A and C members, many of whom were active in S.P.E.C. saw the project as continuing the types of in-service training that the A and C interventions were designed to do. They felt that some of the problems COPED trainees had begun to identify in the Anderson system could be dealt with by S.P.E.C. The elementary school in which the A-trainees had begun training for the development of a school-community sent a team to the first S.P.E.C. lab.

The S.P.E.C. project was discontinued after the first year due to several internal problems, as well as opposition from school personnel and the community. No overall evaluation plans had been made for the first year; this was to have been done at the end of the project. Consequently, as with COPED, it is difficult to assess the affect of the projects' interventions on the total school system.